

C 4957

SL

96510

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE
HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION

C 4957

SL

96510

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE
HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION

AN
ANSWER TO A PAMPHLET,
INTITVLED:
THE FISHER CATCHED IN HIS
OWNE NET.

IN VVHICH, BY THE VVAY, IS SHEVVED,
That the Protestant Church was not so visible, in al
Ages, as the true Church ought to be: and conse-
quently, is not the true Church.

Of which, men may learne infallible Faith, ne-
cessarie to Salvation.

By A. C.

MATTH. 28. vers. 19, 20.

*Going, teach al Nations, baptizing them, &c. Behold, I am
with you AL DAYES, even to the consummation of the
World.*

EPHES. 4. vers. 11, 14.

*Christ gave some Apostles, and some Prophets; other some
Euangelists, and other some PASTORS and DOC-
TORS, &c. that we be not Children, WAVERING
and CARRIED ABOUT with euerie winde of Doc-
trine, &c.*



M. D. C. XXIII.

8

c4957

ANSWER TO A LAMPHLET

INTRODUCTION

THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE
DECEMBER

IN THE YEAR OF THE REFORMATION
THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE

THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE
THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE

THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE
THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE

THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE
THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE

THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE
THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE

THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE
THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE

THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE
THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE

THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE
THE HIGHER CATHOLIC IN THE



M.D.C.XXIII



THE PREFACE.

Gentle Reader, although I doubt not, but at that be-
wise and iudicious especially if they duly consider
the occasion and state of the question lately treated
(in a Conference betwixt D. White and D. Fearly
Ministers; and M. Fisher and M. Sweet Iesuits) wil easi-
ly discern (even by that false Relation, which is set out in
print by a Protestant) that the Protestants Cause hath not
gained any thing: Nevertheless, because those who be par-
tially affected, or of meane capacitie, may (as it is to be doubt-
ed diuers doe) conceiue and speake amiss of this matter, to
the disgrace of the Catholike Cause, and the preiudice of their
owne and other mens soules: I haue thought it needful to set
out a true Relation of the occasion, progresse, and issue of that
Conference, and this in such sort, as diuers falsehoods of the
Protestant Relator, may be easily perceined, and the weak-
nesse of the Protestants Cause may be evidently discovered;
which is also so bad, as it seemeth it cannot be supported, but
by setting out such lying Relations; the sight and considera-
tion whereof, maketh me more easily beleene that to be true
which I haue read, viz. That a decree was made by Di-
uines in Geneva, desyning it lawful to lye for the honor
or credit of the Gospel; and that conformably to this de-
cree, an English Minister being told that one of his Pew-
fellowes had made lyes in stead of proofes of his Protestants
Religion, did answer, saying: He cannot lye too much in
this cause. It must needes be a weake and bad cause, that
needeth to be supported by such weake and bad shifts. I for
my part wil not promise, to haue perfectly remembred and

Eudaimon Io-
hannes in de-
fens. p. H. Garn.

D. Bishop a-
gainst Rob.
Abbotts.

8

The Preface.

set downe every word that passed in this Conference, especially spoken by by-standers; nor to haue strictly obserued the precise order of euery passage: but for the substance, and truth of the matter that I doe relate, I assure, that there shal not be found any falsehood, vnesse it be in some of those Parcels; which I doe not relate of my selfe, but out of the Protestants Relator: whose Relation ordinarily as I doe not contradict, vnesse it be vpon necessarie occasion; so I doe not intend to approue: but simply relating what it saith, I wil leaue it to others to iudge, what they thinke fit of it. Onely this I wil say, That euery one may beleene it so farre, as it relateth any thing, which may aduantage the Catholique Defendants, and their Cause, or disaduantage the Protestant Disputants, and their Cause. For it is certaine, that no man wil lye for the aduantage of his Aduersarie, or his Cause; nor for his owne disaduantage. But in such things as it hath set downe aduantageously for the Protestant Disputant, or his Cause, there is iust reason to suspect it; in regard I am told, that D. Featly himselfe (who is said to be the Author) hath confessed, That more is said in the Relation, then was said in the Conference it selfe; and I am sure something is left out, which was said, and something mis-reported.

This being premised, by way of Preface,

I wil begin to discourse of the
matter it selfe.



CHAP. I.

*About the first occasion of the Conference, in which is shew-
ed, that Master Fisher did not seeke it, or prouoke his
Aduersaries by any challenge vnto it, nor did intend to
haue it so publike, as by his Aduersaries fault it proued*

The Protestant Relator of this Conference, setteth downe
the occasion in these words.

“ **E** DWARD BVGGES Esquire, about the age of
“ 70. yeeres, being lately sicke, was solicited by
“ some Papists then about him, to forsake the
“ Protestant Faith, telling him: There was no
“ hope of saluation, without the Church; there was no
“ Catholike Church but theirs; and to beleue the Ca-
“ tholike Church, was the Article of his Creede; and
“ by it, could no other Church be meant but the Church
“ of Rome, because it could not be proued by al the
“ Protestants in the Kingdome, that they had any
“ Church before *Luther*.

“ This Gentleman being much troubled in his mind
“ with these and the like suggestions, who al his life
“ time had beene, and professed himselfe a Religious
“ Protestant, became now more sicke in mind then
“ body.

“ After his recouerie, being much troubled in mind
“ with these former suggestions of the Popish Priests,
“ he repayred to Sir *Humphrey Lynd* Knight; who, by rea-
“ son of his alliance, and long acquaintance with him,
“ gaue the best satisfaction that he could to his said Cou-

"so Master *Begger*, who seemed to take content in such
 "his Conference, and to be well satisfied by him, in
 "all points.

"But the Popish Priests and Iesuits not desisting to
 "creepe in further, where they had once made a breach,
 "perseuering stil in questioning him, where his Church
 "was before *Luther*.

"Whereupon hee repayred againe to Sir *Humphrey*
 "Lynd, and required some further satisfaction of him,
 "concerning that demand. And thereupon Sir *Humphrey*
 "Lynd told him, it was first in Christ and the Apo-
 "stles, consequently also conspicuous in the Primitiue
 "Church, for 600. yeeres after Christ, after which time
 "some errors crept into the Church, as diseases into a
 "mans body, so that the Church which *Luther* & we ac-
 "knowledge, was in general the same Christian Church,
 "as his body was the same substantial body being now
 "well and lately sick, though different in the quali-
 "ties, &c.

A very weak
 and insuffi-
 cient satisfac-
 tion, as is shew-
 ed hereafter.

How farte this parcel of the Relation is true or false,
 I wil not stand to discasse; as nor yet knowing how, or
 by whom, the aforesaid Gentleman came first to doubt
 of his Church, and consequently of his Religion; yet I
 haue some cause to doubt, that it is not altogether true,
 especially in that he saith: *The Popish Priests and Iesuits*
 "not desisting to creepe in further where they had once made
 "a breach, perseuering stil in questioning him: where his
 "Church was before *Luther*? For I doe not thinke that
 many (if any at all) Priests or Iesuits, did first put this
 doubt into the old Gentleman his head, nor perseuered
 in questioning him about it. And for Master *Fisher* in
 particular, I know certainly that hee neuer saw this old
 Gentleman, much lesse did he speake to him, in any mat-
 ter of Religion, til that time, when Sir *Humphrey Lynd*
 first

first met Master *Fisber*. The which meeting is mentioned in the Protestant Relation, saying thus :

“ And after his returne to London, the said Sir *Humphrey Lynd* going to Master *Buggs* his house in Drury lane, to visit him, found Master *Fisber* the Iesuit there, where after some debates about Religion, and the visibilitie of the Church, Master *Fisber* called for Pen and Inke, and set downe this question *in terminis*, thereby adding vnder his hand, that he would answer vpon it negatiuely, as challenging and expecting Opposers; deliuering also the Paper into the hands of the said Sir *Humphrey Lynd*; who vpon view of it, answered : That it was an Historical question, and not so proper for disputation. But Master *Fisber* vrging it, Sir *Humphrey* told him : If he would goe to D. *White*, where formerly he had bene, the said D. would easily resoluue those doubts, which being refused by the Iesuite, the said Sir *Humphrey* did then returne him his Paper againe, and so left him.

In this parcel some thing is omitted, some thing misreported, as wil appeare by this which followeth :

A certaine Catholike Gentleman, comming to Master *Fisber*, told him : That the aforesaid old Gentleman was desirous to heare D. *White* and him dispute; and therefore desired to know, whether he would think it conuenient to vndertake a meeting with D. *White*. M. *Fisber* told him expressely, that hee neither might, nor would make any challenge to D. *White*; but, saith hee : If D. *White* doe challenge me, I wil not refuse.

And some reason M. *Fisber* gaue to the Gentleman, to let him see, that it was not fit that he should be a Challenger in such a businesse : whereupon the Gentleman, for feare of mis-deliuering M. *Fisber*s mind, did intreat M. *Fisber* to deliuer his owne answer to a Protestant Knight,

Knight, Sir *Humphrey Lynd*, who was imployed by the said old Gentleman, to moue *D. White* to come to such a meeting. *M. Fisher* having some acquaintance in the house where the old Gentleman was, said: He would that night be there, and if the Knight would come, he should heare the same answer. So *M. Fisher* came, and Sir *Humphrey* (being aduised by the said Catholike Gentleman, of *M. Fishers* intention to be there) also came. And after some speeches, the question was moued, Whether *M. Fisher* would speake with *D. White* about the visibilitie of the Church? He answered as before: That he would not challenge *D. White*; but if *D. White* would challenge him to treat of that matter, he would not refuse. It was answered: That it was not meant in the nature of a challenge, but to haue a quiet meeting, to satisfie the old Gentleman: and so Sir *Humphrey* wished *M. Fisher* to set downe the questions. Then *M. Fisher* having heard wherein the Gentleman did chiefly doubt, set downe these two questions:

Whether there must not bee in al ages a visible Church, of which, al sorts must learne that one infallible faith which is necessary to salvation?
Whether the Protestants Church was in al ages visible, especially in the ages before Luther: and whether the names of such visible Protestants in al ages, may be shewed out of good Authors?

The first question being read before Sir *Humphrey* and the old Gentleman, and some others, they said: That it was out of question, that such a visible Church as the question mentioned, must needes bee granted; whereupon *M. Fisher* tooke his Pen, and subscribed to the first question, these words: *It is granted.*

Which being supposed; *M. Fisher* read the second question,

on, and was contented: it should be the onely Question, for so Sir *Humfrey* desired; who also bad *M. Fisher* choose, whether he would be the Disputer or Answerer. *M. Fisher* said, It would be requisite both to dispute and answer. Yet Sir *Humfrey* vrging him to choose the one or other part, *M. Fisher* said, *I wil answer*; and so he tooke his Pen, and writ in the Margent briefly, what answer he meant to make to the whole Question; and said: *I wil answer, that it was not*; to wit, so visible as the Question required.

This Paper, in which these Questions were, Sir *Humfrey* tooke, but with intent, that onely one, that is, the second, should be disputed on. Then question being made about the Place, Sir *Humfrey* named *D. Whites* house. *M. Fisher* said, he had no reason to goe to the Doctors house; in regard, the last time he was there, it was giuen out, and made a general report, That *M. Fisher* would haue killed *D. White* in his house. And therefore, saith *M. Fisher*, I wil not goe, vnlesse himselve inuite me: but if he inuite, I wil goe. Sir *Humfrey* doubted, that *D. White* would not inuite *M. Fisher*: and so, for want of agreeing about the Place, *M. Fisher* verily thought, that no meeting would be at al: yet he did not take againe the Paper, in which the Questions were; but eyther left them with Sir *Humfrey*, or the old Gentleman: yet without any minde at al, to make any challenge, as he had more then once expressed.

“ About two dayes after (saith the Protestant Relator) *M. Buggs* repayred to Sir *Humfrey Lynd*, and entertained him (for his satisfaction) to giue *M. Fisher* a meeting, saying: That *M. Fisher* had againe told him, “ That he would maintaine what he had set downe; and “ that our Diuines could not proue our Church visible, “ before *Luthers* time. Whereupon Sir *Humfrey* told
B “ him,

"him, That *D. White* and *D. Featly* were to dyne with
 "him on Fryday following; and if, after Dinner,
 "M. *Fisher* would come thither, with foure, or six at the
 "most, they should be admitted for his sake and his
 "Wifes, who (by reason of such sollicitation) were
 "troubled in their mindes; and satisfaction should be
 "giuen, as occasion required. And these were the true
 "causes of the meeting.

What to say to this Parcel, I know not, because it was
 priuate, betwixt Sir *Humfrey* and the old Gentleman.
 But there were other more remarkable passages, omitted
 by the Protestant Relator, which I thinke fit to set
 downe. As first, That M. *Fisher* comming to the old
 Gentleman, the next day, or next but one, after the Que-
 stion was set downe; found him stil desirous, to haue
 the meeting goe forward: and then it may very wel be,
 that M. *Fisher* might say; *He would maintaine what he*
had set downe, and that Protestant Diuines could not proue
the Protestant Church visible, before Luthers time. But
 what in particular he said, he doth not remember. Onely
 he is sure he made no challenge; and so the old Gentle-
 man did wel vnderstand: who told M. *Fisher*, That it
 was intended onely to be a friendly and a priuate mee-
 ting at Sir *Humfrey* his owne house: and that *D. White*
 would bring with him one to assist him, as M. *Fisher*
 should bring with him one to assist him; and beside,
 some foure more, whom they thought good, to be Wit-
 nesses; and two Writers, to set downe on each part
 what was said: and that Fryday next should be the
 day.

M. *Fisher* hearing this equal offer, did not refuse: but
 (to prepare the mind of the old Gentleman, to be better
 able to make benefit of what should be said about it)
 writ, and deliuered vnto him a Paper, shewing briefly
 and

The occasion of the Conference.

7

and plainly, how the true visible Church of Christ must be so visible in al Ages, as that the names of some principal Members thereof, in euery Age, may be shewed out of good Authors.

A true Copie of which Paper, I thinke fit here to set downe; in regard it may serue others, as well as this old Gentleman, to vnderstand, Why Catholiques doe ordinarily so much presse Protestants, to name (if they can) Protestant Professors, in al Ages, as Catholiques doe in printed Bookes ordinarily set downe, a Catalogue of the Names of the chiefe Pastors, and other principal Members of the Catholique Roman Church, in al Ages.

A Copie of the first Paper, which M. Fisher writ, and deliuered to the old Gentleman, before the meeting.

1. It is certaine, There is one, and but one true infallible Faith; without which, none can please God, nor consequently, attaine eternal Salvation.

Eph. 4.
Heb. 11.

2. This one infallible Faith cannot be had (according to the ordinarie course of Gods providence) but by hearing Preachers and Pastors of the true visible Church, who onely are lawfully sent and authorized to teach the true Word of God.

Rom. 10.
v. 14, 15.
Eph. 4. 11.

3. As therefore this one infallible Faith hath bene, and must be, in al Ages: so there must needs be in al Ages, Preachers and Pastors of the true visible Church; of whom, al sorts of people haue in time past (as appeareth by Histories) learned, and must in al future times, leaue the said infallible Truth.

Ofc. 2. v. 19, 20.
Isa. 59. 20.
Matth. 18. 20.
Eph. 4. v. 11.

4. Hence followeth, That if Protestants be the true

B 2

visible

visible Church of Christ; al sorts of men, who in euerie Age haue had the aforesaid infallible Faith, haue learned it, by hearing Protestant Preachers, whose names may yet be found in Histories; as the names of those are found, who in euerie former Age did teach and conuert People of seueral Nations vnto the Faith of Christ.

Hence further followeth, That if these cannot (as there cannot) be found in Histories, Names of Protestant Preachers, who in al Ages did teach al sorts of faithful People, and who conuerted seueral Nations vnto the Christian Faith: Hence followeth, I say, That Protestants are not the true visible Church of Christ; neither are their Preachers lawfully sent, or sufficiently authorized to teach; nor People securely warranted, to learne of them that one infallible Faith, without which none can possibly please God, nor (if they so liue and dye) be saved.

If any Protestant wil answer; let him set downe Names of Protestant Preachers in al Ages, who taught People Protestant Doctrine in euerie seueral Age; or confesse, there were no such before Luther; or, at least, not in al Ages to be found in Histories.

After this, M. Fisher the old Gentleman see a little printed Booke, in which was a Catalogue of visible Roman Professors in al Ages: wishing him to urge his Ministers, to shew (if they can) a like Catalogue of their Protestant Professors. And it is very likely, that this Booke (as also the foresaid Paper) was by this old Gentleman carryed to Sir Humphrey: from whom, about two or three dayes before the meeting, a Paper was sent to M. Fisher: containing the former Question, and another like Question proposed to him, to dispute vpon: the contents whereof were as followeth.

" The

The occasion of the Conference.

"The question proposed by M. Fisher, in which he undertaketh to maintaine the negative, is set downe by him in *hec verba* :

"Whether the Protestant Church was in al ages visi-

ble, especially in the ages going before Luther : and

whether the names of such visible Protestants, in al

ages, can be shewed and proued out of good Authors?

"To this vniuersal demand (requiring rather an Historical large volume then Syllogical briefe disputes, we answer, That although :

1. "Diuine infallible Faith is not built vpon deduction out of humane Historie, but diuine Reuelation, as is confessed by the Schoolemen, and expressly by Bellarmine, *Historia humana non facit fidem nisi humanam*.

2. "And this question is grounded vpon vncertaine and false supposals : yet wee require this Proponent, putting him to his owne taske in his owne defence, by propounding to him the like question: *viz.*

"Whether the Romish Church, (that is, a Church holding the particular entire doctrine of the now Romanists, as it is comprised in the Councell of Trent) was in al ages visible, especially in the first 600. yeeres; and whether the names of such visible or legible Romanists in al ages can be shewed and proued out of good Authors?

"We wil answer negatiuely, That no such Church or Professors can be shewed.

This Paper being deliuered to M. Fisher, he writ a second Paper, to explicate the meaning of his question,

to shew in equal method of proceeding in the Disputation.

A Copie of a second Paper, written by M. Fisher before the meeting.

M. Fisher being requested thereunto, for satisfaction of a Gentleman, propounded two questions:

1. The first, Whether there must not be in al ages a visible Church, of which al sorts are to learne the infallible Faith, necessary to saluation?

2. The second, Whether the Protestant Church was in al ages visible, especially in the ages going before Luther; and whether the names of such visible Protestants in al ages can be shewed, and proued out of good Authors?

To the first question, Sir H. and others that were present, assented; so as it was subscribed with these words, *It is granted*: and so M. Fisher was content, that his second question should be the only question. Then Sir H. hauing left it to the choice of M. F. whether he would answer, or dispute: M. F. did choose to answer, and defend the negative part. So as it lyeth vpon Sir H. and those whom he shal choose, to make his party good, to proue out of good Authors the affirmative; to wit: *The Protestants Church was in al Ages visible, especially in the ages before Luther. And likewise, they must set downe the names of such visible Protestants in al ages, as was demanded.* When Sir H. or his friends shal haue performed this their taske, M. Fisher wil performe what is required in the Paper sent vnto him by Sir H. in the same sort and sence, as he requirerth Sir H. and his friends to performe their taske.

For auoyding therefore of al mistaking, and consequently,

quently, needlesse and fruitlesse Disputes, M. F. in his question requireth :

1. That names of men in al ages be set downe, whom Sir H. and his friends conceiue to haue bin Protestants.

2. That those men whose names they set downe, be shewed out of good Authors, to agree in holding some points of Faith, in which Protestants differ from the Romane Catholikes.

3. That Sir H. or his friends wil defend against M. F. that the same men held no other points of Faith, one differently from another, and from the present Protestant Doctrine (contayned in the 39. Articles, vnto which al English Ministers are sworne) for otherwise they cannot make one and the same Protestant Church.

In this sort and sence, when Sir H. or his friends shal haue shewed a visible Protestant Church in al ages, then M. F. or his friends wil in a like proportionable sort and sence, shew, proue and defend a visible Romane Church in al ages.

This Paper was deliuered to the old Gentleman, and was confessed to haue beene receiued by the Doctors before the disputation, and before the meeting. The time and manner of which meeting is set downe by the Protestant Relator, in manner following :

" The 27. of Iune, 1623. M. Fisher, M. Sweet, Iesuits,
" and some others with them, came to Sir H. Lynds
" house, in a little dyning roome, where they found the
" aforesaid M. Buggs, his wife and children, and others
" of Sir H. friends, that had then dined with him, toge-
" ther with some others also : whose comming in, as
" the said Sir H. did not expect ; so he could not with
" ciuillitie put them forth his house, but did instantly
" cause his doores to bee locked vp, that no more
" might enter : notwithstanding which his command,
" some

“ some others also came in scattering, after the conference began.

In this parcel it is to be considered, how great care *M. Fisher* had to haue the meeting secret, and how well he obserued the fore-appointed conditions: in which he was so punctual, that after he had his number, of one Assistant, and foure Witnessies, and a Writer, he would not so much as tel a Gentleman of his acquaintance (who had by other meanes vnderstood of the meeting, and the place of meeting) at what houre the meeting should be; whereas on the contrary part, so much speech was made of it, by some of the Protestant side, that, (beside the number appointed to be Auditors) many Protestant Gentlemen and Gentlewomen, and some Noblemen, and many Ministers, did repaire to Sir *Humphrey* his house, which *M. Fisher* found to be so filled, as he complained to Sir *Humphrey* of the inequality of that Audience, compared with the few, he brought; which Sir *H.* could not denie, but excused himselfe in such manner as he could, saying: He could not helpe it, &c.

CHAP. II.

About that which passed in the Conference it selfe.

“ **D**OCTOR *White* and Doctor *Fently*, being inuited to dinner (saith the Protestant Relator) by Sir *Humphrey Lynd*, and staying a while after, had notice giuen them, that *M. Fisher*, and *M. Sweet*, Iesuits, were in the next roome, ready to conferre with them, touching a Question set downe by *M. Fisher*, vader his owne hand, in these words: viz.

“ *Whether the Protestants Church was in al ages visible,*
and

“and especially in the ages going before Luther. 2. And
 “whether the names of such visible Protestants, in al
 “ages, can be shewed and proved out of good Ambors?

“This Question being deliuered to the parties aboue
 “named, and it being notified vnto them, that there
 “were certaine persons who had beene solicited, and
 “remaining doubtful in Religion, desired satisfaction
 “especially in this point; they were perswaded to haue
 “some speech with the Iesuites touching this point:
 “the rather, because the Priests and Iesuites doe dayly
 “cast out Papers, and disperse them in secret; in which
 “they vaunt, That no Protestant Minister dare encoun
 “ter with them in this point.

Any man reading this parcel, would be induced to
 thinke, that D. *Whire* and D. *Featly* had neuer had no
 tice before, for what end they were invited to Dinner,
 or for what end they were to meet with the Iesuites: but
 that they were on the suddaine summoned to this Con
 ference, without any preparation, or knowledge of the
 Question. Which not to be so, is evidently conuincied,
 partly, by that which is alreadie said, partly, by that
 which I am after to say.

2. This Relator would make his Reader belecue, that
 M. *Fisher* vnder his owne hand had set downe the words
 of the Question, distinguished with the expresse figure
 of 2. Which is not so, for M. *Fisher* did not write any
 such figure of 2. in the middle of the Question, nor did
 not meane to make any more then one only entire Que
 stion, as Sir *Humfrey* himselfe had desired.

3. He seemeth willing to perswade, that Priests and
 Iesuites doe dayly cast out Papers, which is not true.

“At the beginning of this meeting, when the Dispu
 “tants were set (saith the Protestant Relator) D. *Featly*

“ drew out the Paper, in which the Question about re-
 “ heard was written, with these words in the Mar-
 “ gent, viz. *I wil answer, that it was not*; and deman-
 “ ded of M. Fisher, Whether this were his owne hand?
 “ which after he had acknowledged, D. Featly began as
 “ followeth:

D. Featly. “ *ov. 34p.* To this vniuersal demand, re-
 “ quiring rather an Historical large Volume, then a Syl-
 “ logistical briefe dispute, we answer:] And then he
 read out of a Paper (which this Relator would make
 men belecue to haue beene said *memoriser*) the same
 in effect, which was written before the meeting, to
 M. Fisher.

1. “ That although diuine infallible Faith is not
 “ built vpon deduction out of humane Historie, but
 “ vpon diuine reuelation, as is confessed by your owne
 “ Schoole-men, and expressely by Cardinal Bellarmine,
 “ *Historia humana faciunt tantum fidem humanam, cui*
 “ *subesse potest falsum*: Humane Stories and Records
 “ beget onely an humane Faith, or rather Credulitie,
 “ subiect to error; not a diuine and infallible Beleefe,
 “ which must be built vpon surer ground.

2. “ Although this Question be grounded vpon vn-
 “ certaine and false supposals: for a Church may haue
 “ beene visible, yet not the names of al visible Profes-
 “ sors thereof now to be shewed and proued out of
 “ good Authors: there might be millions of Profes-
 “ sors, yet no particular and authentical Record of
 “ them by name: Records there might be many, in
 “ ancient time, yet not now extant, at least for vs
 “ to come by: Yet we wil not refuse to deale with
 “ you in your towne Question, if you, in like man-
 “ ner, wil vndertake the like Taske in your owne
 “ defence, and maintaine the Affirmatiue in the like
 “ Question,

" Question, which we now propound vnto you here
" in writing.

" Whether the Romish Church, (that is, a Church holding the particular entire doctrine of the new Romanists, as it is comprised in the Conneel of Trent)
" was in al ages visible, especially in the first 600.
" yeeres; and whether the names of such visible or
" legible Romanists in al ages can be shewed and proved out of good Authors?

Here the Relator omitteth to tel how M. Fisher caused the two Papers, written and giuen the old Gentleman, as is abouesaid, to be publicquely read: by the first whereof, it appeared why he had propounded such a Question: by the second, the true sence and meaning of the Question was explicated, and a conuenient Method of proceeding was prescribed, with due proportion to be observed on both sides.

Then D. Featly beginning to argue (in this place, and not in the end of the Disputation, where the Protestant Relator placeth it) did say: M. Fisher, I wish, I warne, I command, I coniure you, to answere truly and sincerely, in the sight of God, and as you wil answere it at the Day of Iudgement. To this M. Fisher said: I willingly accept your warning, and I wish you to obserue the like.

About this time M. Sweet propounded these Conditions to be obserued.

1. That al bitter speeches should be forborne.
2. That nothing should be spoken, or heard, but to the purpose.

Which second he did propound, to preuent impertinent digressions.

Neuerthelesse, after this, D. *Fearly* made a long digression, altogether impertinent to the Question which he was to dispute of: for in stead of prouing a Protestant visible Church, and naming visible Protestants in al ages, he made a vaine and vnseasonable bragging offer, to disproue the Roman Church in diuers particular points (as are rehearsed by the Protestant Relator) which he read out of a Paper. Whereunto as he was speaking, M. *Sweet* according to the second Condition, before propounded, answered, *That these things were then impertinent, and nothing to the purpose.* But M. *Sweet* did not say, as the Relator reporteth, *They are Scholustical points not Fundamental.* Neyther was there any such Syllogisme then made, as the Relator annexeth.

D. *Fearly* hauing ended his long digression, M. *Fisher* said (as the Protestant Relator telleth:) After you haue proued your Church visible in al ages, and named the Professors thereof, I wil satisfie you in your particulars.

D. *Fearly*. " In the meane while, name but one Father, but one Writer of note, who held the particulars about named for fīue hundred yeeres after Christ. To which instant demand of D. *Fearly* (saith the Relator) nothing was answered.

But neyther was this said, neyther was it needful to answer. First, for that M. *Fisher* formerly answered, That he would satisfie al particulars, after the visibilitie of the Protestant Church, in al ages, was shewed, as the present Question required. Secondly, because to dispute of these particulars, was vnseasonable, and not to the present purpose: as likewise was that other motion, made by Sir *Humphrey Lynd* to M. *Sweet*, to dispute of *Transubstantiation* out of S. *Augustine*. To which motion, being (as I said) vnseasonable, M. *Sweet* answered wel,
 accor-

according to his second Prouiso, saying : *That is not new to the Question.*

“ Then D. Featly said (saith the Protestant Relator)
 “ there are two meanes onely to proue any thing by necessary inference, to wit, a Syllogisme, and an Induction ; other formes of Argument haue no force, but as they are reducible to these. I proue the visibilitie of our Church by both, and first, by a Syllogisme.

No, saith M. Fisher, you must not onely proue it to be visible, but so visible, as the names of Protestant Professors in al ages may be shewed out of good Authors.

“ To this, D. Featly said : There are two *Quæres* in your Question: First, Whether the Protestants Church were in al ages visible ? And secondly, Whether the names of such visible Protestants can be shewed ?

No, said M. Fisher, my Question is meant to be but one entire Question : and so, to cut off al needlesse wrangling (made by D. White and D. Featly about the Aduerbe *Verum*, *Whether*, and the Copulatiue *Et*, *And*, as if Grammar Schollers had beene disputing, rather then graue Diuines, who were not to stand vpon rigor of Grammar, especially in this case, where the sence of the Speaker is plaine, and may wel stand with Grammar) M. Fisher said : The Question being mine, it pertaineth to me to tel the meaning ; and my meaning was, onely to make it one Question : *viz.*

Whether the Protestants Church were so visible, as the names of visible Protestants, in al ages, may be shewed out of good Authors ?

Wherefore, if you wil dispute, you must dispute in my sence, and must conclude the Affirmatiue : *viz.* The Protestant Church was so visible, as the names of the

Professors in all ages may be shewed out of good Authors. Proue this, or proue nothing.

(D. Featly.) " This Church, which is so visible, as the
" Catholique Church ought to be, and as the Popish
" Church is pretended by M. *Fisher* to be, is so visible,
" that the names of the Professors thereof may be pro-
" duced and shewed, in all ages, out of good Authors.

" But the Protestant Church is so visible, as the Ca-
" tholique Church ought to be, and as the Popish
" Church is pretended to be. *Ergo*

M. *Fisher*. " I denie the *Minor*.

Minorem probate.

D. Featly. " That Church, whose Faith is eternal,
" and perpetual, and vchanged, is so visible, as the
" Catholique Church ought to be, and the Popish
" Church is pretended by M. *Fisher* to be.

" But the Faith of the Protestant Church is eternal,
" perpetual, and vchanged. *Ergo*

To this, M. *Fisher* answered: first excepting against
the Word, *Eternal*; saying: Faith is not eternal, or *ab-
eterno*.

It is true, said a Minister who sat by; Faith is not e-
ternal, but euiternal.

Neyther so, said M. *Fisher*; for it is not to be for euer
in Heauen.

It is eternal (said D. *White*) in *Predestination*.

So (said M. *Sweet*) D. *White* himselfe may be said to
be eternal: and he might haue added, this present Dispu-
tation may be said to be *Eternal*.

D. Featly. " You haue a purpose, M. *Fisher*, to cauil:
" you know my meaning wel enough, by the terme *Per-
petual*; to wit, that Christian Faith, which hath conti-
" nued from Christs first publishing it, til this present,
" and shal continue vntil his second comming, &c.

If

If this were said by D. Featly (which is doubted) he should haue considered, how he and D. White cauilled vpon the word *Whether*, and *And*, when they knew M. Fishers meaning wel enough; yea, after they had heard him plainly explicate his meaning: Whereas M. Fisher onely put them in minde to speake properly, like Scholers, and did not cauil or reply, after D. Featly did explicate his meaning. But to returne to the argument.

D. Featly. " That Church which holdeth this Faith, " you beleeeue shal be so visible, that the names of the " Professors thereof may be shewed in al ages.

" But the Protestant Church holdeth this perpetual " Faith. *Ergo*

M. Fisher. " Your argument is a fallacie, called *Petitio principij*.

D. Featly. " A demonstration, *a causa*, or *a priori*, is " not *Petitio principij*.

" But such is my argument. *Ergo*

" Is it not a sounder argument, to proue the visibilittie of the Professors from the truth of their Faith; then as you, the truth of your Faith from the visibilitie of Professors? Visible Pastors argue " not a right Faith. Heretikes, Mahumetans, and " Gentiles, haue visible Professors of their Impieties: yet will it not hence follow, that they " haue a right beleefe. On the contrarie, we know " by the Promises of God in the Scripture, That " the Church which maintayneth the true Faith, " shal haue alwayes Professors, more or lesse, visible.

M. Sweet. " You ought to proue the truth of " your Church *a posteriori*, for that is to the Question, " and not *a priori*.

D. Feat-

D. Featly. *Shal you please to use my Weapons?*
 Is not an Argument *a priori* better then *a posteriori*?
 To this, M. Fisher said: A prooffe *a posteriori* is
 more demonstrative then *a priori*.
 Thus farre the Relator, who hath here added much
 more then was said: and in particular, those formal
 words which he reporteth M. Fisher to have said: *viz.*
A prooffe a posteriori is more demonstrative then a priori,
 M. Fisher did not speake: perhaps he might say, That a
 prooffe *a posteriori* doth better demonstrate to vs then
a priori: not meaning in general to preferre a Logical
 demonstration *a posteriori* before that which is *a priori*;
 but that such a prooffe *a posteriori*, as he in this present
 Question required, and as the Question it selfe exacted,
 would better demonstrate or shew to al sorts of men,
 which is the true Church, then any prooffe which
 D. Featly or D. White can make *a priori*, to proue the
 Protestant Church to be the true Church, as shal be
 shewed when need is, hereafter: at this present it may
 suffice to say to that which D. Featly now objecteth a-
 gainst the prooffe taken from visibilitie, That although al
 kind of visible Professors doe not argue right Faith, yet
 want of visible Professors argueth want of Christs true
 Church. For supposing it to be true, which euen
 D. Featly himselfe here saith (according to the Prote-
 stants Relator) *viz.* *We know by the Promises of God in*
the Scripture, that the Church which maintaines the true
Faith, shal haue alwayes Professors, more or lesse, visible:
and (as M. Fisher further proued in one of the foresaid
Papers, giuen to the old Gentleman before this meeting)
so visible, as their names in al ages may be shewed out of good
Authors. Supposing also out of D. Whitaker, *contra Dur.*
 l. 7. p. 472. That whatsoeuer is fore-told by the ancient
 Pro-

Prophets, of the propagation, amplitude, and glory of the Church, is most clearely witnessed by Histories; and supposing listly but of D. John White, in his *Way* p. 138. That things past cannot be shewed to vs; but by Histories. Supposing al this (I say) it is most apparant, That (if there cannot be produced (as there cannot) names of Protestants, or of any other Professors of Christian Faith, in al ages, out of Histories, to whom Gods Promises agree, beside those which are knowne Roman Catholikes) not Protestants, nor any other, but onely the Roman Catholikes are the true Church of Christ; which teacheth the true Faith, and of which al sorts are to learne infallible Faith, necessarie to Salvation.

But as for the argument, which D. Feath wil needes perswade vs not to be *Petitio principij*, but *Demonstratio a priori* viz.

That Church, whose Faith is eternal, and perpetual, and vnchanged, is so visible, as the Catholike Church ought to be, and as the Popish Church by M. Fisher is pretended to be.

But the Faith of Protestants Church is eternal, perpetual, and vnchanged.

Ergo, The Protestants Church is so visible as the Catholike Church ought to be, and the Popish Church is pretended by M. Fisher to be.

This argument, as it is set downe, is so farre from being a *Démonstration* (whose proprietie is to contince the Vnderstanding) as it is not a probable or Moral perswasion: For I am verily perswaded, that no wise man (not already possessed with Protestant opinions) wil or can be so much as morally conuincd, or in any sort probably perswaded by it; That Protestants be the true visible Church; more then a man (in case of doubt) can be by the like argument, which a man may make to proue him-

selfe and his Brethren to be as wel spoken of, as any in al the Parish. Thus: Those who are in heart true honest men, are as wel spoken of, as any in al the Parish.

But if and my Brethren are in heart true honest men.

As this proofe is not able to make any man not partially affected to beleue these men to be wel spoken of, or to be honest men; so neither can D. Featlyes prooffe make any wise man beleue Protestants to be the true visible Church, or to haue the true Faith.

Secondly, if the terme, *That Church*, be vnderstood onely of a particular Church (as for example, the Church of England) it is so farre from a Logical Demonstration, as it hath not in it any Logical forme, according to any of the vsual Moods, *Barbara, Celarent, &c.* But if it be vnderstood vniuersally, of *every Church*, that is, or may be; then both *Maior* and *Minor* are false: and so it cannot be a Demonstration, whose propertie is to consist of most certainly true propositions. The *Maior* in this latter sense is false: for that there may be a Church, or Companie, who may haue inward Faith, eternal and vnchanged (as for example, a Church of Angels) who for want of visible Profession are not so visible, as the Catholike Church ought to be. The *Minor* is false also: for the Protestant Church hath not the true Primitiue Faith, neither is that Faith they haue vnchanged, but so often changed, and so much subject to change, as one may say (as a great Person in Germanie once said of some Protestants) *While they hold this yeare, I doe in some sort know; but what they will hold next yeare, I doe not know.* Which is true, in regard they haue no certaine and infallible Rule, sufficient to preserve them from change. But if D. Featly shal say, That he neyther meant the

terme,

testime, *That Church*, in eyther of the aforesaid senses, but meant to signifie by it, that one holy, Catholike, and Apostolike Church, which the holy Scriptures doe shew both to haue perpetual vncchanged Faith, and also to be perpetually visible: Then indeed the *Mayor* is true. But the *Minor* is most false: and so the argument is farre from being a Demonstration, especially when it endeou-
 reth to proue *Major notum per ignotum*, viz. the Visible-
 title (which is easily knowne) by the truth of Doctrine (which is more hard to be knowne) especially by onely
 Scripture of the sense: Whereof (according to Protestants, who say) The whole Church may erre, no particu-
 lar man can be infallibly sure. For if the whole Church or Compaignie (to whom Christ promised the Spirit of Truth, to teach them all truth) may erre: Then much more may euery particular man erre; and consequently, no particular man can be infallibly sure of the sense of Scripture. *1 Cor. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.*

10. 14. v. 16.

c. 16. v. 13.

Thirdly, This argument beggett or supposeth that which is in question: For in asking which is the true visible Church, or Congregation of the true faithful; we aske, we least of all, which is the true Faith; in regard, the true Church cannot be without this true Faith. Yea, therefore doe we aske which is the true Church; that of it, being first knowne by other Markes, we may learne what is the true Faith in all points, in which we yet know not what is to be held for true Diuine Faith.

Fourthly, Although Faith be pre-required to be in some of other members of the true Church; yet inward Faith alone, without some outward profession, by which it is made visible, or sensible, doth not sufficiently make a man to be a member of the visible Church.

Let D. Featly therefore looke backe vpon His argu-

ment, and tells what Academical Learning taught him to call a Demonstration *a priori*.

But let vs heare how M. Fisher did answer this argument, according to the Protestant Relator.

M. Fisher. "I distinguish the *Maior*.

"That Church, whose Faith is perpetual, and vntchanged, so as the names of the Professors may be shewed; is so visible, as the Catholike Church ought to be, and as M. Fisher pretendeth the Roman Church to be: I grant it.

"That Church, whose Faith is perpetual, and vntchanged, yet so, as the names cannot be shewed in all ages; is visible, as the Catholike Church ought to be, and as M. Fisher pretends the Roman Church to be: I denie it. To the *Minor* I apply the like distinction; and consequently, to the *Conclusion* in the same manner.

D. Featly. "What? answer you to the *Conclusion* also? This is a shew of new Logick.

This idle exception, M. Fisher (attending to the matter) did not regard; but might haue told him, That it is not usefull, after a distinction made both to *Maior* and *Minor*, to apply the like to the *Conclusion*. For although it be true, That in a Syllogisme, when *Maior* and *Minor* are absolutely granted, the *Conclusion* must not be denied, nor distinguished, but must be absolutely granted; yet when *Maior* and *Minor* also be distinguished, the *Conclusion* may be distinguished. And I marvel what Rule of Logick D. Featly can bring against this?

In like manner, if D. Featly did say any such words as the Relator telleth: viz. A strange distinction of the eternitie of Faith, by Professors to be named and not to be named: What are Professors nominable, or innominable, to the eternitie of Faith?

If (I say) D. Featly did say these words ; it is like, M. Fisher did not regard them, as being impertinent : but might haue said, That this distinction had not relation to eternal Faith, but to a Church which hath eternal Faith : about which, it imports much to know, whether it hath Professors nominable, or innominable. For if it hath not, it is inuisible ; or, at least, not so visible as the true Catholike Church (of which, al sorts in times past haue learned, and in time to come must learne the infallible Diuine Faith, necessarie to Saluation) ought to be.

Therefore M. Fisher might wel (though I thinke he did not) say as the Relator telleth, *Tolle distinctionem*, M. Fisher. " and conclude that which I denie : That the Faith of " the Protestant Church is so eternal, as the names of visible Protestants in al ages may be shewed.

To proue this, D. Featly made this argument, according to the Protestant Relator.

D. Featly. " That Church, whose Faith is the Catholike and Primitive Faith, once giuen to the Saints, " without which no man can be saued, is so perpetual, as the names may be shewed in al ages.

" But the Faith of the Protestant Church is the Primitive and Catholike Faith, once giuen to the Saints, " without which none can be saued.

Ergo, " The Faith of the Protestant Church is so perpetual, as the names may be shewed in al ages.

Note here, That the Relator putteth in the Margent, ouer-against the *Minor*, *Tollitur distinctio*. But how false this Marginal Note is, appeareth to any who wil reflect vpon what the Distinction was, and what I haue now said of it : For this *Minor* speaking onely of Faith doth not take away the distinction applied to the Church.

That which D. *Featly* thinketh to be a Straine of new Logicke, to wit, to distinguish vpon a proposition, without applying the distinction to any particular tearme, is not so strange as he maketh it. As for example: When one saith, *An Ethiopian is white*; neyther the tearme *Ethiopian* alone, nor the tearme *White* alone in it selfe needeth distinction, because it is not *Equiuocal*; but the whole proposition, being *Amphibological*, needeth; it being true, if it be meant, *The Ethiopian is white in the Teeth*: and false, if it be meant, *He is white in his whole Bodie*.

To the argument. M. *Fisher* said: *I denie the Minor*. But marking, that hereupon D. *Featly* would haue transferred the Question to endlesse disputes, about particular Controuerfies, from the present general Question, about the perpetual visible Church; whose Professors names (as himselfe saith) may be shewed in all ages. M. *Fisher* (I say) marking this, would not let D. *Featly* make his prooff: but hauing said, *I denie the Minor*; he presently added, by way of explication, these ensuing words:

My first Question was, Whether there must not be a true visible Church of Christ in all ages, of which all sorts must learne that infallible Faith, which is necessary to Salvation? and therefore, we must first finde such a Church, before men can know it to be such, as they may securely learne of it, what is the infallible Faith, necessary to Salvation.

While M. *Fisher* was beginning to make this explication, D. *Featly* insulted, as if M. *Fisher* durst not, for Conscience, denie the *Minor* absolutely. To whom, M. *Fisher* said: *I doe absolutely denie it*. And then he went forward with the aforesaid explication. Which ended, M. *Fisher* said: And hereupon I answer againe to the said *Minor*; If this proposition be taken simply in

in it selfe, I absolutely denie it: but if this proposition be considered (as it must be) as related to the first Question, and the end thereof, I further adde, That it is not pertinent to that end, for which the whole Dispute was intended: viz. To shew to those who were not able by their owne abilities to finde out the infallible Faith, necessarie to Salvation, without learning of the true visible Church of Christ: and consequently, Visibilitie of the Church is first to be shewed, before the truth of Doctrine in particular shal be shewed.

To this (as the Relator saith) D. Featly replied: viz. "First, What speake you of those, who are not able by their owne abilities to finde out Faith? Is any man able, by his owne abilitie, without the helpe of Diuine Grace? Secondly, What helpeth the Visibilitie, to confirme the Truth of the Church? Visibilitie indeed, proues a Church, but not the true Church.

These words eyther were not spoken, or M. Fisher did not regard them, being in the middest of his answer: in which he went on, shewing the necessitie of a visible Church, by a saying of D. Fields: viz. *Seeing the Controversies of Religion at this day are so many in number, and so intricate in nature, that few haue time and leysure, fewer strength of wit and vnderstanding, to examine them: what remaineth for men, desirous of satisfaction in things of such consequence, but diligently to seeke out which, among al the Societies of men in the World, is that Spouse of Christ, the Church of the liuing God, which is the Pillar of the Truth; that so they may embrace her Communion, follow her Direction, and rest in her Iudgement?*

M. Fisher therefore (I say) being busily speaking this, did not regard what D. Featly did then say, but might easily haue answered: First, That he neuer meant, that any were able of themselves, without helpe of Gods grace,

D. Field in his
Epistle Dedicatory.

grace, to attaine the true Faith; which hindreth not, but that some may haue that abilltie of Wit and Learning, by which they can better examine *Controuersies* of Faith, then those who want these abilities. Secondly, Although *Visibilitie* alone doe not prooue the true Church, yet it (supposing Gods Promises, That the true Church shal be alwayes visible) much helpeth: and want of *Visibilitie*, in any one age, proueth a *Companie* not to be the true Church.

D. Featly. " The summe of your former answer was,
 " That the *Minor* of my former Syllogisme was both
 " false, and impertinent. It is neyther false, nor impertinent : *Ergo*, your answer is false, and impertinent.
 " And first, it is not false.

M. Fisher. " I answer to the Antecedent, That it is
 " both false, and impertinent : but I adde, That for the
 " present it must be proued to be pertinent; or else it
 " diuerteth vs from the chiefe end of our dispute: which
 " was, as I said before, That infallible Truth may be
 " learned of the true visible Church; and not the true
 " visible Church, by first finding every particular infallible Truth : and by that, to conclude which is the true
 " visible Church.

D. Featly. " I prooue that the *Minor* is pertinent :
 " That *Minor* proposition, which together with the
 " *Minor* doth necessarily and directly inferre the conclusion of the *Minor* last denyed, is pertinent to the
 " probation of that *Minor* denyed.

" But the *Minor* proposition of the third Syllogisme,
 " doth necessarily and directly inferre the conclusion of
 " the *Minor* last denyed.

" *Ergo*, the *Minor* of that Syllogisme is pertinent.

" M. Fisher did distinguish the *Major*. That *Minor*
 " proposition, which together with the *Major* doth necessarily

“ necessarily inferre the *Conclusion*, so as it may serue for
 “ that purpose to which the whole Dispute is ordained;
 “ I grant it to be pertinent.

“ But if it doe inferre the *Conclusion*; yet not so, as
 “ may serue for that purpose for which the whole Dis-
 “ pute was ordained: I denie the *Maior*.

Here (saith the Protestant Relator) the Disputants
 iarr'd, and so the Writer ceased.

What this larré was, is not set downe, nor by me re-
 membred, vnlesse it were about this subsequent Syllo-
 gisme.

D. Featly. “ That *Minor*, which together with the
 “ *Maior*, inferres the Proposition last denyed, the whole
 “ processe hauing beene *per directa media*, is pertinent
 “ to that purpose to which the Dispute is ordained.

“ But the *Minor*, together with the *Maior*, directly
 “ and necessarily inferres the Proposition last denyed;
 “ the whole *Processus* hauing beene made *per directa*
 “ *media*.

“ Ergo, It is pertinent to that purpose, to which the
 “ Dispute is ordained.

M. Fisher. “ Your *Media* in your Syllogifines were
 “ *directa*, but they tended not *ad directum finem*.

If M. Fisher did say these words, his meaning may be
 gathered out of his former explication: in which he
 shewed, how the direct end of the Disputation was (not
 to treat of particular Controuersies, but) to finde out
 first by other meanes the true visible Church, whose
 Professors names may be shewed in al ages out of good
 Authors. Which being once found, men desirous of sa-
 tisfaction, might (as D. Field said) rest in her Iudge-
 ment; who otherwise (as Lawyers without a Iudge)
 might wrangle in euerie Controuersie, without end.

Those *Media* therefore *directa* (as D. Featly tearmed

E them)

them) might in some sort be so tearmed, as being directed by D. Featly to his owne end, of transferring the Question to particular Controuersies, but not *ad directum finem*; that is, not ordayned to the direct end of the whole Disputation: viz. To shew a visible Church of Protestants in al ages, whose names may be shewed out of good Authors. Which (supposing D. Featly would haue proceeded sincerely) ought to haue beene his onely end: as M. Fisher signified, by saying these words; *Responsum nullum dabunt prater unum quod nunquam dabunt, ecce nomina.*

D. Featly therefore had no iust cause to say, as the
 " Protestant Relator maketh him say: It is a Bul,
 " M. Fisher, *media, directa*, yet not *ad directum finem*;
 " that is, direct, and not direct: for *media* are said to be
 " *directa* onely *ratione finis*.

D. Featly (I say) had no iust cause to say this: and M. Sweet might wel tel him of his fault, in seeking to transferre the Question from the Church, to particular points of Faith, as the Protestant Relator saith he did; saying:

" Is not, *Transitio a genere in genus*, a fault in arguing? &c.

But M. Sweet did not speake these formal words which the Protestant Relator hath set downe: onely he asked the Doctors, Whether it seemed strange to them, that a Question should be transferred by a good Syllogisme: which he said, in regard D. Featly endeouored to proue his argument to be pertinent, because his Syllogismes were good.

Here D. Featly (as the Protestant Relator telleth)
 " said: I acknowledge, that *Transitio a genere in genus*,
 " is a fault in disputing; but I neuer heard, that the inference of the effect by the cause, was *Transitio a*
 " *ge-*

“ *genere in genus* : such was my argument. For Faith
 “ in a Beleuer produceth profession and confession
 “ thereof, which makes a visible member ; and the like
 “ profession of many members, a visible Church. Where
 “ the cause is perpetual, the effect must needs be per-
 “ petual : Therefore, where the Faith is perpetual, the
 “ profession thereof must needs be ; and consequently,
 “ the visibilitie of the Professors thereof, is this *Trans-*
 “ *itio a genere in genus*?

But D. Fearey did not say al this ; yet if he did, it
 doth not make any thing against M. Sweet : and for him
 to speake of the cause, being obscure, when the Question
 is onely about the effect, being more apparant and cleare
 (as in our case) is a fault in honest and sincere dealing.
 Neyther is M. Sweets Logicke lesse to be esteemed, if
 he had tearmed that fault *Transitio a genere in genus* :
 For a cause as a cause, and an effect as an effect doe not
 onely differ *specie*, but also *genere* : and beside, a prooffe
a priori and *a posteriori* are diuers kinds of prooffes.

“ Here (sayth the Protestant Relator) those of
 “ M. Fishers side calling for Names, D. White said :
 “ Where are your Names ?

“ This is nothing but apparant tergiversation. You
 “ wil not answer any argument directly, nor suffer vs to
 “ proceed in our arguments : and therefore I require
 “ you, M. Fisher, according to the order mentioned in
 “ the beginning, for each partie to haue an houre and a
 “ halfe for that you now oppose, and suffer me to
 “ answer.

“ Proue by Christ and his Apostles, or by any of the
 “ Fathers for the first six hundred yeeres, these present
 “ Tenets of the Roman Church : and then he named
 “ (as the Protestant Relator sayth) sixe particular
 “ Points.

But D. *White* did not speake thus, neyther did he in al the Conference make any such long discourse. Yet if he had so said, M. *Fisher* might wel haue answered, as the Protestant Relator saith he did.

M. *Fisher*. " When you D. *White*, or D. *Fearly*, haue
 " proned your Church to be visibie in al ages, and nam-
 " med visibie Protestants ; then wil I satisfie your de-
 " mands.

But before this was done, M. *Fisher* had no reason to diuert to those particular matters, nor to produce Names of Catholikes in al ages ; in regard it was his aduersaries fault to spend so long time in impertinent Syllogismes, which should haue beene imployed in naming and proving Protestants in al ages: which by the prescribed method was first to be done, before M. *Fisher* needed to proue any thing pertaining to the Roman Church. Worthily therefore might M. *Sweet* cal for Names of Protestants, and wel might he say: That if Protestants had beene in al ages, their Names (at least some) in euery age might be produced.

Vnto which, as the Protestant Relator saith, D. *Fearly* replied, saying: That is a *Non sequitur*, &c. What say you to a People of Africa, who (if we may beleue *Plinie*) haue no Names at al?

" M. *Bentley*. Yet they haue descriptions, and may be knowne by some *Periphrasis*.

" D. *Fearly*. What say you then to the Heretikes, called *Acephali*, who are so called, because their Head and Author cannot be named, nor particularly described ; yet the Author was a visibie man? Are al visibie mens Names vpon record? Are al the Records that were in former times, now to be produced?

" To this Obiection, M. *Boulton* answered: That those *Acephali* held some particular Doctrine, which did
 " amount

“ amount to the nature of a Name, sufficient to distinguish them from others; insinuating hereby, that these *Accephali* were not *Anonymi*.

Further, it may be answered, That it is not certaine, whether they had any particular Author: for some say, That they were a Companie, who in the Controuersie betwixt *John* the Bishop of Antioch, and *Ciril* of Alexandria, behaued themselues like Neutrals, submitting themselues to neyther, as to their Head. Others thinke, That they were certaine men, who being the fauorers of *Petrus Magnus* the Heretike, did afterwards renounce him from being their Head, because he would not accurse the Councel of Calcedon. Others say, That one *Seuerus*, Bishop of Antioch, was their Author.

But howsoeuer this particular were, it doth not conclude, That there could be in al ages visible Professors of the Protestants Faith, whereof no Storie nor other ancient Monument maketh mention of Names, or Opinions, or Places of abode of any of them, or of those who opposed them: as Stories make mention of some of these circumstances, both of the *Accephali*, and whatsoeuer other eminent Professors of euerie true or false Religion.

We doe not require, that al visible mens names should be vpon record, nor al Records produced. For although to proue such a visible Church as that of our Sauour Christs, described in Scripture to be spread ouer the World, a smal number of visible Professors be not sufficient, as *S. Augustine* prooueth against the Donatists; *Aug. lib. de unitate Ecclesie.* yet to shew how confident we are of our cause, we for the present onely require, That three eminent Protestants Names in al ages be produced out of good Authors. But they are so farre from being able to produce three, as they cannot name one in euerie age (as is clearly proued in the Protestants Apologie) neyther indeed

can they abide with any patience, when they be much pressed in this Point: as appeareth by diuers who haue beene vrged; and in particular, by *D. Featly*, in this Conference: who hauing beene called vpon feuerall times to produce Names, as he had vndertaken; at one time he burst forth into these words, set downe by the Protestant Relator: *What? wil nothing content you, but a Buttrie-Booke? You shal haue a Buttrie-Booke, if you wil stay a while.*

Note (Reader) this Doctors want of grauitie and patience, and what a fit Title he giueth. to a Catalogue of Names of Protestants; who (indeed) are more like to be found in a Buttrie-Booke, then in any good Record of Antiquitie: as hauing had their beginning of late in one *Martin Luther*; who, after his Apostasie, more respected the Buttrie, then any Ecclesiastical Storie.

But how vnwilling *D. Featly* was to bring out this his Buttrie-Booke, appeareth; in that after the Auditorie had long stayed and often called for the Names of Protestants in all ages, which should haue been giuen at first; after not onely Catholikes, but also diuers of the Protestants (being wearie and not willing to heare any more of his dilatorie and impertinent Syllogismes) had entreated him to giue ouer his arguments, and to produce Names.

First, he said: If I should giue ouer, *M. Fisher* would say of me, as he said of *D. White*, That I was at a *Non-plus*: and therefore I wil goe forward in arguing.

To which, *M. Fisher* said: Then wil I goe forward in answering.

But the Companie earnestly calling for Names, *D. Featly* bad the Writer set downe in writing, That
he

he was willing to proceed ; but to satisfie the Companie, he would divert unto the Names.

Which M. Fisher seeing to be written, said : Ynlesse this be blotted out, it shal be set downe for Answer ; That *hitherto* D. Featly *having* diverted from the chiefe end of the Question, wil now speake to the purpose,

M. Sweet also said : That it was a manifest wrong. Whereupon the former words were blotted out.

And it was written (as the Protestant Relator sayth)
 “ That both the Disputants being willing to proceede,
 “ D. Featly was desired by the Companie, to produce the
 “ Names of such Protestants as were extant before Luther, in al ages.

This being written, and subscribed both by D. Featly and M. Fisher, D. Featly proceeded to his Induction. But before he would begin to name any, he first endeavoured to forestall his hearers with an ill opinion against M. Fisher, saying :

There is no credit to be giuen to this man, who not onely slandered D. White in a former Conference, but also falsely writ what passed betwixt M. Mucket and my selfe, in a certaine Disputation.

M. Fisher hearing this false slander, did rise vp, and for the honour of the Truth, and clearing of his Credit, did (before the Audience) solemnely protest, ypon his Conscience, That wittingly and willingly he did neuer wrong eyther D. White, or D. Featly, in report of any former Conference. And if any thing were false written, it was not willingly : but, as the Protestant Writer of this present Conference hath sometimes mistaken the words of the Disputants ; which, as he (being warned) did correct : so did I (said M. Fisher.)

To this, nothing was replied : and therefore I suppose that the Audience was well satisfied of *M. Fishers* sincerity in his Relation, and writing of the former Disputations.

After this, *D. Featly* named for the first age, our Lord and Saviour Christ, and the Twelve Apostles, and *S. Paul*, and *S. Ignatius* : after which he stayed a while, as if he studied for more Names ; but not remembering any more, whom he would set downe for the first age, he said : These, not denying others, may serue for the first age.

Then turning to *M. Fisher*, he said : Let vs dispute of these. No, said *M. Fisher* ; name first of all ages. What ? said *D. Featly*, wil you not dispute of Christ and his Apostles ? Yes, said *M. Fisher*, in due place : but first name the rest in all ages, and then I wil answer you. What ? said *D. Featly*, doe not Christ and his Apostles deserue the first place ? *M. Fisher* : I wil not answer, before you haue named the rest.

Then, said *D. Featly*, in a heat : Wel, you wil not dispute of Christ and his Apostles ? Then you grant, Christ and his Apostles to be Protestants. And so instantly (without expecting *M. Fishers* answer) he turned himselfe to the Audience, and said : *He grants Christ and his Apostles to be Protestants*. Whereupon diuers of the Audience made such a shewt (as if they had gotten a Victorie) with such a noyse, as *M. Fisher* endeauouring to answer, for a time could not be heard. But he rising vp, and with his Hand and Voyce crauing silence, made such as would heare him, vnderstand how falsely *D. Featly* had slandered him to his Face ; and eyther then, or vpon some like occasion, he said : *What may I expect behind my backe, when you thus mis-report me to my Face ?*

And

And in this sort when many of the company were willing to depart, D. Featly (being called vpon as is seemed) by some of his companions to goe away, did arise and offer to begone: yet in his rying he turned to M. Fisher, saying: *Will you dispute vpon Christ and his Apostles, or no?* To which M. Fisher sayd, *I will, if you will stay.* And stretching out his hand, he tooke D. Featly by his arme, offering to stay him, yet he in that abrupt manner went away.

This is the true Relation of this last passage; by which the falshood of that Relation which is made by the Protestant Relator, may appeare: For to make the best of D. Featly his Terquiuersation, or rather plaine flight from proceeding in his Induction, and to cast some colour ouer the matter, by which he may make Protestants belieue, that D. Featly had reason, and M. Fisher was to blame; First he maketh M. Fisher say, *You shall not begin with Christ and his Apostles:* as if M. Fisher had prohibited him to begin with the names of Christ and his Apostles, which he did not: neyther did he say those words at all, which the Relator reporteth. Secondly he suppresseth in silence M. Fishers expresse yealding to dispute about Christ and his Apostles, which M. Fisher did expresse two seuerall tymes: once thus; *I will dispute of them in due place:* the second tyme when D. Featly would needs begon, and in going asked, *will you dispute or no?* thus, *I will, if you will stay.* Thirdly he relateth a Syllogisme to be made in this last passage, which is not remembred; but if it were, it was very impertinent to an Induction, and may easily be answered out of that which was formerly sayd against a like Syllogisme called by D. Featly, *A Demonstration a priori*, but is proued not to be so much worth as a probable prooffe *a posteriori*. Fourthly he relateth a conjuring charge

charge to haue byn made by D. Featly to M. Fisher, in this last passage, which was not made.

But to returne to the breaking vp of the Conference. So soone as D. Featly had in the abrupt manner aforesayd, gone away, and left M. Fisher and M. Sweete, and diuers others of good ranke sitting at, or neere about the Table, amongst whome was the Earle of Warwick, who not liking (as it seemed) that the matter should end in that ill fashion, made a speech to M. Fisher, and tould him, that the Doctour should come againe, and giue the rest of the Names of Protestant Professours after some dayes, it being requisite that the Doctour should haue tyme to study for them. To which M. Fisher sayd, he was willing he should take tyme. Then the wryting of such things as had passed in the Conference (being subscribed vnder D. Featly, and M. Fishers hands) was wrapped vp in a paper, and sealed vp with three seales, one with my Lord of Warwicks, and the other with two other seales, & left in Syr Humfrey Lynds hands, or some other Protestant, with promise that it should be kept vnopened till the next meeting, and that M. Fisher afterwards should haue it, or a true copy of it: which promise hath not yet been performed, partly by reason the next meeting was prohibited; but by whose meanes this prohibition came, although I will not Censure (as the Protestant Relator sayth, a Romanist hath confidently auerred) that the Protestant party laboured to haue all future meetings, touching this occasion, forbidden, because they cannot make good that which they haue vndertaken about naming of Protestant Professors in all ages; yet I can not hinder men to haue such like suspicion, because I know it is impossible for Protestants to performe that vndertake Task.

Now.

Now whereas myself haue heard that some suspected, that the Catholike party had made meanes to get the second meeting hindered, this idle fancy hath no foundation of any probability. For all Catholikes are confident, that Protestants can neuer produce out of good Authours, Names of the Professors of this their new Reformation, no more then any other Sect of Heretikes can produce the Names of men of their profession in all Ages since Christ: whereas Roman Catholikes in their printed Bookes ordinarily set downe the Names of their Professors, and chiefe Pastors in all Ages: And soe the victory being so certaine on their side, they had no reason to hinder the meeting, whereby this question should be determined, especially in such sort as is prescribed in *M. Fishers* second paper (above rehearsed) written before the last meeting. And in particular for *M. Fisher* and *M. Sweet*, it is most certaine, that they much desired the second meeting, as may appeare: First, in that the next day after the last meeting, they went to *Syr Humfrey Lynds* house, offering to giue vnto him a Catalogue of Names of such as they would defend to haue been Professors of the Roman Fayth in all Ages, that he might deliuer it to *D. Fealy* and *D. White* to consider of agaynst the next meeting, vpon condition that they should also reciprocally deliuer yp to *M. Fisher*, & *M. Sweete*, a Catalogue of such as they would defend to haue been Protestants in all Ages, to be considered off against the sayd next day of meeting. The which offer seemed to another Protestāt (who was then in *Syr Humfrey Lynds* company) very reasonable and equall. But *Syr Humfrey* sayd: *No, I know the Doctors myndes, that they will not giue vp any Catalogue before the very meeting*: and he asked *M. Fisher*, why he did so much presse the Doctors for names of men of their

To whome *M. Fisher* answered that the *Earle* (as he said plainly) was, because he was fully perswaded, that they could not give vp any such Names. After this *M. Fisher* and *M. Sweete* reflecting vpon *Syr Hamonds* words, began to suspect, that there would be no more meeting, vnles the *Earle of Warwicke* (who had engaged himselfe by his word to *M. Fisher* that it should be) did presse the Doctours vnto it: wherfore it seemed good that the *Earle* should be moued heerunto by a letter writtē by *M. Fisher* vnto him, the copy wherof I haue thought good, to insert heere as followeth.

Right Honourable Lord.

I esteeme it a speciall prouidēce of God, that your Lordship was present at a late Conference, wherein *D. White* and *D. Fealy* vnderooke to shew against me, & my companion, that the Protestant Church had been visible in all Ages, and that their Professors might be named; especially in all Ages, before *Luther*. Your Lordship may remember the substance of all the prooffe to haue consisted in this, *That the true Church was alwayes so visible, as the Professors thereof in all Ages might be named: But the Protestants was the true Church;* we refused to dispute of the *Minor*, because it transferred the question, and auoyded that plaine prooffe of the visible Church, which was then propounded and expected. If, as they conclude, they are able to name their Professors in all Ages, why did they refuse to give vs a Catalogue of theirs, as we were ready to haue giuen them another of ours? Why went they about to proue they were able to name them, when with lesse adoe they might haue named them? Where deeds are iustly expected, words without deeds are worthily suspected.

Certainly heerby they are so farr from hauing discharged

charged themselves, of the great enterprife they vnder-
 tooke, as they stand more engaged then before to the
 performance of it: for hauing now professed and ack-
 nowledged that the true Church, or (to vse their owne
 words) the Church which is so visible as the true Ca-
 tholike Church ought to be, (and the Church whose
 sayth is *eternall* and *vnchanged*, must be) is able to name
 her Professors in all Ages, eyther for their owne ho-
 nour, and for the satisfaction of the world, they must
 set downe the Names of their Professors in all Ages, or
 els they shamefully discouer themselves not to be that
 true and visible vnchanged Church which is able to
 name them. Againe, at the length yealding as they did
 to thew the continuall visibility of their Church, by a
 full induction of their visible Protestants in all Ages
 (which they seemed to vndertake with great confi-
 dence) why did they sticke in the first Age alone, refus-
 ing to name their Professors in the Ages following,
 vntill the first were tryed? May not the Answerer
 choose to deny which parte of the Argument he plea-
 seth? And was it euer heard that he should be inforced
 to reply to one proposition alone, before the whole
 Argument, whether it were Syllogisme or Induction,
 were fully propounded? Very Nobly therfore, & pru-
 dently your Lordship in the end desired another mee-
 ting, not doubting that your owne party within 3. or
 4. dayes, would be content to giue vs the Names of
 their Professors in all Ages, as we were ready to giue
 them the Names of ours, that therby both sides might
 be the better prepared for a second Tryall, which whe
 they haue performed, we shall not sayle to encounter
 with them, eyther by way of speech or wryting, as
 your Lordship (all things considered) shall thinke fai-
 rest, or safest, or most conuenient for the discouery of
 Truth.

But if your Lordship shall not be able to obtaine at their hands this your most iust and important Request, the defect of proof on their part must needs be accounted a plaine flight; and no man hereafter can prudently relye his saluation vpon that Church, which (for want of perpetuall visibillity proued) they themselues shall haue concluded to be false and fayned.

Thus expecting the yssue heerof, and your Lordships further pleasure from the mouth of this bearer, I remaine, this first of Iuly 1623.

Your Lordships servant in Christ,
John Fisher.

By this Letter it may appeare how willing M. Fisher and M. Sweete were, and yet are, of their part, to haue the matter soundly prosecuted, cyther by meeting or wryting. And I haue heard that the Earle to whome this letter was written, did send to D. Featly, so, as although there be a prohibition of meeting, yet it is expected that by way of writing D. Featly goe forward to performe his vndertaken Taske, and setting downe first the Names of such as he iudgeth to haue been Protestant Professors in every Age since Christ: And then prouing out of good Authors, those whome he nameth, to haue byn members of the Protestant Church, not condemning any one point wherein Protestants at this day do differ from the auncient and Roman Church, and especially in any one of the 39. Articles which English Protestant Ministers are sworne vnto; and therefore so long as D. Featly, and D. White shall be silent, and not so much as by writing giue a Catalogue of Names of the Professors of their Church, all sorts of people may iustly take this their sayling for a flight, and for a silent graunting, that they haue not had

had visible Protestants in all Ages, whose Names may be shewed out of good Authors, as the question required. Whereupon followeth, that the Protestant Church is not the true Church of Christ, nor the Preachers thereof lawfully sent to teach, nor people securely warranted to heare and learne of them, what is, and what is not to be belieued, by Fayth necessary to saluation.

CHAP. III.

Of the issue of the Conference.

THE Protestant Relator sayth, that the issue of the Conference was, that the aforesaid M. *Bugge* came to *Syr Humfrey Lynd*, & gaue him many thanks for the sayd meeting, and assured him he was well resolu'd now of his Religion; that he saw plainly that it was but the Iesuits bragging without proofes: and whereas formerly by their Sophisticall persuasions he was in some doubt of the Church, he is now so fully satisfied of the truth of our Religion, that he doth vtterly disclaime the Popish Priests company, and their doctrine also.

I haue cause to doubt that this which the Relator sayth, is not true, for thesby he maketh the old Gentleman to be but of a weake capacity, or of a very mutable nature. For first I am sure, there was no cause giuen in the Conference of any such effectuell resolution to be made by the old Gentleman. Secondly I cannot see when this speech should be made by the Gentleman to *Syr Humfrey*. If immediatly after the Conference, it would argue toto much want of capacity: for if he did but rightly conceiue the true state of the question, in which himselfe had especially desired to be satisfied (as

I verily

I verily hope he did) he might easily haue marked the insufficiency of *D. Featly* his diuerting proofes, which also were so answered, as the Audience for want of satisfaction in them, yrged him to leaue off, & to produce Names of Protestants in all Ages: the which producing of Names being so often and earnestly required to be done in all Ages, and yet being only pretended (and that most falsely) to be done for one Age, and the Conference being so abruptly left of by *D. Featly* before he would go forward to name men in other Ages, especially in Ages before *Luther*, as the Question required; any meane capacity might see, that the Question in which the old Gentleman desired to be satisfied, was not fully answered, nor consequently he satisfied.

Moreouer the same Gentleman being present when the *Earle of Warwick* told *M. Fisher*, that *D. Featly* should at another tyme come againe to giue Names of Protestants in other Ages, he might easily, and doubtles did, vnderstand that as yet Names in all Ages were not giuen, nor consequently the Question satisfied, in which he expected answere. Furthermore presently after he went away from the Conference, he told *M. Fisher* himselfe, that he was glad, that at the next meeting his Question should be answered, which shewed that as yet he did not conceive it to be answered.

Lastly, diuers dayes after all the trouble and styrr, was past (which was made about the Conference) the old Gentleman was not so resolute a Protestant as the Relator pretendeth: for meeting *M. Fisher* and *M. Sweete*, he desired them to giue him a Catalogue of Names of Professors of the Romā Church, saying, that if after this the Doctors should not giue him a Catalogue of Protestants, he should dislike their cause. Which Catalogue *M. Fisher* and *M. Sweete* haue ready for him,
but

but will not deliver, till he get the Doctours to make theirs ready, that he may bring to them the Doctours Catalogue with one hand, and receive theirs with the other to deliver to the Doctours.

All that can be suspected is, that in the very tyme of the sayd styrre when the old Gentleman eyther was, or feared to be called in question, it may perhaps be, that he might say those words which the Relator mentioneth; but this (if it were) was only vpon frailty or humane feare of trouble, and not any firme and settled resolution grounded vpon the Conference; sith both before and after he shewed a contrary mynd, as hath byn sayd.

As for other idle and false reports of a great Lady (a), or any other Catholiks sayd to haue ben turned Protestants vpon this Conference, I neglect them as being notoriously false. It may be that some Weaklings who not being present at the Conference, nor hauing commodity to heare what passed, but from the lying lyps of some Protestants (*Who reported that Fisher was overcome, and had yielded Christ and his Apostles to be Protestants*) some Weaklings I say, might perhaps be staggered, vntill they heard the true report, that this was only an impudent slander, vttered by D. Featly, but in words and deeds contradicted by M. Fisher. But I make no question so soone as these shall see or heare what is heere related, they will be well satisfied and confirmed in the Catholike truth; and that euen Protestants themselves, will be moued to harken more after the matter. And in case their Doctours doe not giue them a better Catalogue of Names of Protestants in all Ages, then they did in this Conference, they will doubt, as they haue cause, that the Protestant Church hath not byn so visible in all Ages, as (euen

(a) This great Lady did expressly say: that the conference did make a gainst Protestants; euen as it was related by you Protestant relator.

And another Lady, who was present at the conference did protest (to one that asked her, how it moued her) that she was by it confirmed in Catholique religion.

Lib. 1. Inst. c.
I. Sect. 4.

by D. Feally his argument is proued) the true Catholike Church ought to be; and consequently that it is not the true Catholike Church, which in their Creede they professe to belieue, and out of which (as euen *Caluin* confesseth) they cannot hope for remission of their sinnes, nor saluation of their soules.

CHAP. IIII.

Containing a Review, and Reflection vpon the Premises.

NOW hauing made an end of this Relation, I am to intreate the Gentle Reader, to reuiue it, or reflect vpon it, and to call to mind and marke. 1. The occasion, and consequently the end of the disputation. 2. The Question and true meaning of it. 3. What Methode was most fit to haue been obserued in treating of this question. 4. What course was taken by the Protestant Disputant, & what by the Catholike Respondent. All which being duely considered, thou wilt better see what is to be iudged of the whole Conference, and wilt make to thy selfe more benefit of the matter treated in it, then perhaps hitherto thou hast done.

§. I. About the Occasion, and end of the Conference.

1. The occasion of this Dispute was, as thou hast heard in the Relation, that a certaine old Protestant Gentleman was told (as the truth is) that there is no saluation out of the true Catholike Church, and that to belieue the Catholike Church, is one of the Articles of the Creed, which euery Christian is bound to be-
lieue and know: and that this Church was no other
besides

besides the most auncient and vniuersally spread ouer the world, the knowne Catholike Roman Church, which hath had, and can yet thew visible Pastours & other Professors in all Ages: and that the Protestant Church (wherof for the present, he was a member) sprung vp of late, and could not be the true Church of Christ, as not hauing had (as Christs true Church ought to haue) Pastours and Doctours, and lawfully sent Preachers so visible, as the Names of them may be shewed in all Ages out of good Authors. And this was the occasion of the dispute; for heerupon the old Gentleman was so much moued in conscience to doubt of the Protestants Religion, that he could not be quiet till he had made meanes to get this matter discussed in a Conference betwixt Catholike and Protestant Deuines, in such sort as in the Relation hath byn told. And therefore, the end of this Conference was to giue this old Gentleman and others that should heare it, satisfaction in this most important & necessary point. I call this point, *most important and necessary*, in regard the certainty of enery other point belieued by infallible diuine Fayth, necessary to saluation, dependeth vpon it. For although euery point belieued by diuine Faith be in it selfe most true, and by reason of the Diuine reuelation (made knowne to the world by Christ & his Apostles) most certaine and infallible; yet this truth & infallible certainty therof is not made knowne to vs (according to the ordinary course of Gods providence) but only by the meanes which God hath appointed, to wit, by Pastors, Doctours, and Preachers of the true visible Church of Christ.

Eph. 4. v. iij
&c.
Rom. 10. v.
14. &c.

§. 2. *About the Question and meaning of it.*

The Question propounded to be treated in the Conference vpon the occasion, and for the end aforesayd, was.

*Whether the Protestant Church was visible in all Ages,
 " especially in the Ages before Luther: and whether
 " the Names of such visible Protestants may be shewed
 " in all Ages, out of good Authors?*

The reason why this question was proposed rather then any other, was, for that the old Gentleman was already perswaded that there must be in all Ages a visible Church of Christ, hauing in it visible Pastors & Docters, and lawfully sent Preachers who are by Almighty God appointed and authorized to teach, and of whom all sorts of people are commaunded & warranted to learne infallible Fayth necessary to saluation. And further, that this Church, and these her Pastors & Preachers, haue byn in all Ages past, not only visible, but so visible as the Names at least of some Pastours teaching, and some people learning the true Fayth in all Ages, might be produced out of good Authors. And therefore, as he had heard, the Roman Catholiks made no difficulty to produce out of good Authors the Names of their Pastors & peoble in all Ages: so he much desired to heare, whether the Names of Protestant Pastors and Preachers in all Ages could not also be produced out of good Authors: for if they could, he meant to remaine a Protestant as he had been all his life time: but if they could not, he thought it necessary to leaue the Protestants, and to adhere to the Roman Church, to learne of it Faith necessary to saluation.

By

By this appeareth that the sense and meaning of the Question could be no other then that which *M. Fisher* explicated in the Conference: viz. *Whether the Protestant Church was in all Ages so visible, especially in the Ages before Luther, as the Names of Protestant Pastors and Preachers in all Ages may be shewed out of good Authors.* And further that in case the Protestant Disputant should vndertake (as he did too boldly vndertake) the affirmative part, saying, and offering to proue in generall, that the Names of such Pastors and Preachers of Protestant Religion may be shewed in all Ages out of good Authors; it should further be required (as *M. Fisher* required of him) that he should actually name in particular in euery seuerall Age such Pastors and Preachers as he thought he could proue and defend to be Protestants. For if the Question had not been thus vnderstood, it should not haue been answerable to the occasion and end aboue sayd. Neyther could the Protestant Disputant sufficiently satisfie the doubt of the old Gentleman, being chiefly caused in that he had heard, that no Protestant could name Pastors and Preachers of his profession in all Ages out of good Authors; So as (to satisfy this doubt) it was not sufficient only to say, nor only in generall to proue by such Syllogismes as *D. Featly* made, (which were such as the old Gentleman (I dare say) did not vnderstand) that the Names of Protestants in all Ages may be shewed, but as *M. Fisher* had shewed him a printed booke, in which Roman Catholike Pastours and people were in particuler named in all Ages: so he expected Protestant Pastours, and people of all Ages to be named in particuler; and after proued and defended to be Protestants, as *M. Fisher* was ready to proue and defend whom he would in particuler name, to be Roman Catholikes.

Furthermore although it may seeme to some not much materiall, whether the Protestant, Disputant hath begun to name first those of the first Age, & next of the second, and so downward vntill *Luther*, or contrarywise to beginne with *Luther* and so vpward till the Apostles and Christ; yet both the words of the Question, & the doubt of the old Gentleman had byn far better satisfied, and the Tergiuersation which *D. Featly* vsed in the first age anoyded, if *M. Fisher* had vrged him, as he might, first to beginne with the Age immediatly before *Luther* (a confessed Protestant) and so go vpward vntill Christ, the confessed Fountayne of infallible perpetuall vnchanged Truth: for then it would haue been cleerly seene, euen by the Confessiō of learned Protestants, particularly *Luther* himselfe and others; that those who eyther are named, or can yet be named by *D. Featly*, after he hath sought (as I am told he went to seeke) Records in the great Library in *Oxford*, were not visible Protestants, but of a different Profession, Fayth, and Religion, and so different, as that they cannot be iustly deemed members of one and the same Protestant Church with *Luther*, after his Apostacy from his Religious Order, and reuolt from the Roman Catholike Fayth. For prooffe wherof, I for breuityes sake do refer euery one whose desireth full satisfaction in this point, to what is largely related and proued in the Protestants Apology, in diuers places, but particularly *tract. 2. cap. 2. sect. 11. subdiuision 3.* And will only content my selfe to cyte these few testimonyes for their sakes, who haue not commodity to see that booke.

(1) *Luth. ep. ad Argentin. anno 1515.*

(2) *Conradus Schuselb. in Theol. Calu. lib. 2. fol. 130.*

First therefore (1) *Luther* himselfe sayth: *We dare boast that Christ was first published by vs.* Wherefore the Lutheran (2) *Conradus Schuselburg* sayth: *It is impuden-*

cy to say that many learned men in Germany (and the like is of other Countreys) before Luther did hold the doctrine of the Lutheran Gospell. And another (3) of them not only sayth in effect thus much, but proneth it by this argument: If there had beene right beleeuers that were before Luther in his office, there had beene no need of a Lutheran reformation. Another sayth: It (4) is ridiculous to thinke that in the tyme before Luther any had the purity of doctrine, and that Luther should receaue it from them, & not they from Luther: considering (sayth he) it is manifest to the whole world, that before Luthers tyme, all Churches were overwhelmed with more then Cymerian darkenes, and that Luther was dinely raysed vp to discouer the same, & to restore the light of true doctrine. And least this may be thought to haue beene only the concept of Luther and Lutherans (who yet could better tell then D. Featly, D. White, and such other new Maisters) I will add heereunto what is sayd, first by (5) Caluin, who doth acknowledge, That in this Lutheran reformation, there was made a discesion or departure from all the world. Secondly by (6) Bucer, who calleth Luther, the first Apostle of the reformed doctrine. Thirdly, by Beza (7) a principall Calvinist, who teacheth that at this tyme, ordinary vocation of the Church-men was no where extant, and consequently teacheth, that there was at that tyme no visible Church; and so if any Church at all, it was only inuisible, as is affirmed euē by our owne English Protestant Deuines, namely M. (8) Iewel, who sayth, The truth was vnknown and vheard of when Martin Luther and Vldericke Zuinglius first came to the knowledge and preaching of the Gospell. And M. Perkins (9) who sayth: We say, that before the dayes of Luther, for the space of many hundred yeares an vniuersall Apostacy ouerspread the whole face of the earth, and that our (Protestant) Church was not visible to the World.

(1) Geo. myll. in Augustanæ Confessionis explic. art. 74 de Eccl. pag. 117.

(4) Benedict Morgest. trac. de Eccl. pag. 143.

(5) Calu. in l. epist. ep. 142.

(6) Bucer. ep. ad Epif. Hereford.

(7) Beza in theol. ep. epl. 5.

(8) Iewel in his Apolog. of the Church. 4.

(9) Perkins in his defence 42.

(9) Perkins in exposit. of the Creed.

I might

(*) See the
booke intituled: The
Author and substance of
Protestant religion

See also

Isa. 59. v. 21.

Isa. 61, 9,

Isa. 60, 11,

Matth. 5, 14,

Matth. 28, 17,

Matth. 28, 19,

20

See also

See also

See also

See also

See also

See also

See also

See also

See also

See also

See also

See also

See also

I might adde many more (*) testimonies of others, who eyther in expresse teauemes, or in effect affirme the Protestant Church to haue bene in many Ages, before Luther latent, and altogether inuisible: which indeed was the common opinion of Protestants at their first vprying; who on the one side thought they could with thittes, better answer places of scripture, which made often and honourable mention of the Church, then they could answer the euidence of Histories, and of their owne experience shewing that no visible Protestants were extant before themselves: But now of late, diuers plaine places of Scripture and Fathers hauing bene produced, and such euident reasons deduced out of them, prouing ineuitably that the true Church of Christ, of which all sorts must learne infallible sayth necessary to saluation, must needs be visible in all Ages, as, to omitt others, are these: My spirit which is in thee, and my wordes which I haue put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seede, nor out of the mouth of thy seedes seede from henceforth for euer. Againe: Their seed shall be knowne in Nations, and their branches among people: all that see them, shall know them, that these are the seed which our Lord hath blessed. Againe: Thy gates shalbe opened continually day and night, they shall not be shut, that the strength of the Nations and their kinges may enter into thee: for the nation and kingdome which shall not serue thee, shall perish. Thou art the light of the world: a City built vpon a hill cannot be hid. Tell the Church &c. He that will not heare the Church, let him be vnto thee as an heathen and Publican. Going, teach all Nations, baptizing them &c. Behould I am with you (to wit, your selues, and successors teaching and baptizing) all dayes vntill the end of the world. Conformable to which Scriptures, are also innumerable plaine places of ancient Fathers, which may be

may bee seene in *Coccius*: and among others *S. Augustine* who saith: that the Church being built vpon a mo-
untain cannot be hid.

Coccius in
 thesauro C6-
 trouerfiarum,
 tomo 1. lib. 8.
 art. 1.
Aug. in psal.
 47. lib. de vnit.
Eccliet. cap. 16.
 & 25.

Out of these, and other plaine places of
 of Scriptures & Fathers, euident Reasons also may be
 deduced, shewing that the Church must needs bee
 visible in all ages. As for example, that otherwise it
 cannot bee such a Church as Christ did institute: nor
 could it performe those offices which Christ appointed
 it to performe: nor could those which were in it be
 instructed by it: nor those which were out of it be co-
 uerted to it: nor Heretiques (pretending to be the
 Church) cōvinced not to be it. Wherefore our later Pro-
 testants being not able to sayle any longer against
 this ineuitable *Scylla*, without apparent daunger to
 split their boate, would needes (rather then turne
 back to the safe haue of the visible Catholique Ro-
 man Church) adventure vpon the *Charybdis* of con-
 temning all Monuments of ancient histories, and the
 plaine experience of their primitiue Protestant Patri-
 arches, hoping to escape by landing vpon the imagi-
 nary Iland of inuisible recordes, supposed to haue byn
 written, and after suppressed in the pretended Popes
 persecution of the visible Members of their inuisible
 Church, in the Ages before *Luther*, (as if it were vn-
 safe and such, as if it were good, might serue any other
 Sect of ancient, or present Heretiques, (as well as our
 moderne Protestants) if they would pretend to haue
 had a continuall visible Church of their profession.)
 But alas, who seeth not, that these be meere imagi-
 nary *Chymara's*; or dreames? For if any such people had
 bene (practizing especially rites of their religion,
 though neuer so secretly) they could not euen with a
Gigets ring haue passed vnseene, but cyther with their

H

positiue

positive profession of their owne doctrine, which in some cases obligeth all true beleeuers, or at least with negative profession of fayth, by which all faythfull men, and at all tymes are obliged neuer to make thew and profession of a contrary religion; they, or some of them could not choose but to haue beene noted. And if for that cause any persecution were in that age, as is supposed, infallibly they would haue beene taken (as others of other Religions, in like cases ordinarily are taken) and imprisoned, or otherwise so punished, as the world could not haue beene ignorant of their persons, nor Historyes set out by friendes or enemies silent, in setting downe (as vsually is done) their names, conditions, opinions, punishments, and persecutions, in such tyme, such place &c. And if such recordes of such conspicuous things had been set down in historyes, it is not possible that the memory of such notorious matters could be razed both out of booke, and out of the mindes of men, who without booke do continually deliuer in words to their successors what they saw with their eyes, or heard with their eares of their predecessors, or read in booke to haue byn don to such persons as professed such a Religion, or to haue beene done to such booke, in which mention was made of such persecution, made against professors of that Religion.

To say therefore that such persons were, and yet no record in any booke or other memory of them, or that once such Recordes were, but after were by the Pope razed, or burned, and yet no mention made in any booke, or other monument that such razing or burning of booke was by such a Pope, at such a tyme &c. (as we can yet out of good Recordes tell the booke burned by Dioclesian the Grande Persecutor
of

of Christians:) To say (I say) this, is senselesse, and plainly sheweth, that these men who sought to auoyd the *Scylla* of an inuisible Church, by this thift fall into the *Charybdis* of speaking against sense and experience, and indeed runne backe vpon the *Scylla* of the same inuisible Church; for auoyding whereof they deuised this sandy thift of inuisible Persecutours, inuisible Persecutions, inuisible Recordes of nameles (supposed to be visibly persecuted) members of the Protestant Church in all Ages before *Luther*. O misery! O madness of our poore deceaued Protestants! What? Is it possible, that *Luther* and *Lutherans*, *Caluin* and *Caluinists*, yea our owne Countrey-men prime Protestants, conuincd with the cleere euidency of things in their own dayes, and with plaine Recordes of all ancient Monuments for former ages, doe confesse (as you heare euen now) that *Luther* was the first that announced, or published Christ; that he was the first Apostle of the Reformed doctrine; and this so certainly, that they do account it impudency and ridiculous to say, That there were other visible Protestants in *Germany* before *Luther*; that they proue by argument this to be impossible; that they acknowledge themselves in this Lutheran Reformation to haue departed from all the world; that at *Luthers* and *Caluins* comming no ordinary vocatiō of Church-men (without which the visible Church cannot be) was extant in any place; that the Church both then, and for many hundred yeares before was wholly latent and inuisible? Is it possible, I say, that all this should be confessed by the primitiue Parents, and prime Doctours of Protestancy, and that now their professed children & schollers, and in respect of them, Punyes in Protestant diuinity, dare be so bold (as D. Feally was in

the late conference) to controlle and contradict those his grand Maisters, in not only affirming, but offering to proue by a *Syllogisme*, and by a *Demonstration a priori*, that the Protestant Church hath beene in all Ages visible; and (O wonder!) so visible, as the names of the particular men may be shewed in all ages out of good Authors: and further offering to second this *Syllogisme*, by a full *Induction*, in which he vnder-tooke actually to set downe their particular names in euery seuerall age? Surely the aforesayd Protestants, if they had beene present, would haue wondered to see such boldnes, and would haue censured this attemp to be ridiculous impudency.

By this may appeare how notoriously the old Gentleman, and the rest of the Protestant Audience were abused by D. Featly, vndertaking so boldly to proue both by *Syllogisme* and *Induction*, the affirmative part of the aforesayd question, which was proposed to be treated in the conference, the Negative whereof is so plainly confessed by so many Prime Protestants, as now we haue heard.

4. 3. About the Method.

Concerning the Method, which had beene fittest to haue beene obserued in treating the aforesayd Question; it is to be noted, that there be two seuerall methodes of finding out infallible diuine truth in all points necessary to saluation, the finding whereof was the chiefe end, for which the aforesayd Question about the perpetual visibilty of the Church, was proposed to be treated of.

The first methode or way is, that euery man eyther by his owne wit, or by hearing another discourse

course do examine thoroughly ech particuler point of diuine Fayth, about which Controuersy, or Question is, or may be made, what is, and what is not to be beleueed vnder payne of damnation; the which requireth, 1. Ability and strength of naturall wit, and skill in Latin, Greeke, Hebrew, and other languages, and some art by which he may vnderstand the termes and state of the Question, and all that is written of it. 2. That he reade, or heare, and vnderstand all that is written of that Question in holy Scriptures, Counticells, Fathers, and moderne Writers, and in the originall Languages and Copyes; and what els may be sayd of it, *pro* and *contra*, by learned Disputants. 3. That he doe maturely weigh and ponder all that is sayd, both for the affirmatiue and negatiue part of the Question. 4. That by prayer and good life he obtaine the assistance of Gods spirit to illuminate his vnderstanding, in matters which exceed the capacity of his naturall wit. 5. That all this premised, he of himselfe (without relying vpon the Iudgement of any Church) frame a firme and infallible Iudgement, what is, and what is not to be held, for truth necessary to saluation; and this being knowne, by it, as by a rule, to iudge which company of men are, or are not the true visible Church of Christ in al Ages. Now who seeth not that this methode, or way of attayning found resolution in all particuler points of Fayth, & by that to iudge what company of men are, or are not the true visible Church in all ages, cannot be fit and conuenient to be prescribed to all, or indeed to any sort of men, and especially to such, as neither haue extraordinary ability of naturall wit, or skill in languages, nor art requisite to vnderstand the termes, and state of all Questions, nor leasure to

read, or heare, nor strength of iudgment to weigh and ponder all that is, or may be sayd of them, nor such extraordinary giustes of prayer and other vertues, as they may presume to haue gotten particuler assistance of Gods spirit, more then other men, whereby they may assure themselues, that they in particuler (without relying vpon any Churches iudgement) can firmly and infallibly iudge in euery Question about points of Fayth, what is, and what is not to beleueed, as a truth necessary to saluation.

The 2. methode, or way, which indeed is both most easy, and may giue full satisfaction to all sortes, consisteth in these 3. points, 1. To beleuee and acknowledge, as euery Christian is bound by the articles of his Creed, that there is, and hath beene in all Ages a visible Catholique Church of Christ, which is the Pillar of truth, and in it a visible company of Pastours and Doctours, and lawfully sent Preachers, assisted by the spirit of God (who haue learned of their predecessours, and they of theirs, still vpwardes vntill Christ his Apostles, who learned of Christ, and Christ of God his Father, the infallible Truth in all pointes of sayth) of whome by Gods appointment all sorts haue in all Ages past (as appeareth by Historyes) learned, and must in tymes present, and to come, learne the infallible truth in all matters of Christian sayth necessary to saluation. The 2. is, to discerne which company of Christians are this visible Church of Christ, and who be these Pastours, Doctours, and lawfully sent Preachers, of whome all sorts of men may securely learne what is, and what is not to be held for infallible truth in all matters of sayth necessary to saluation. The 3. is, to heare and beleuee, and obey whatsoever this Company

Isa. 59. v. 21.

60. v. 11. 61. v.

9.

1. Tim. 3. v. 15.

Ephes. 4. v. 4.

11. 12. 13. 14.

Tertul. lib. de

prescript.

Company of Christians haue in all Ages taught, and what the present ordinary Pastours, Doctours, and Preachers there of do reach to be diuine and infallible truth, necessary to saluation : which to do, will not be hard to those, who do truly feare and loue God, and be meeke, and humble in hart, and who can, and will for the loue and seruice of Christ captiuat their vnderstanding, and submit it to the obedience of faith, which must be done by mortifying and denying their owne priuate opinion, that they may follow the sense and iudgment of Christ, speaking in, and by his Catholike Church, *Which whosoever heareth, beleueneth, & obeyeth, doth heare, beleue, and obey Christ. And, VVhosoever contemneth, or will not heare, beleue, and obey the Church, he contemneth Christ, and by Christs owne censure is to be accounted, as an Heauen or Publican.*

Luc. 10.v. 16.

Matth. 18.v. 17.

Now, concerning the first and third of these points, as no doubt or difficulty was moued either by the old Gentleman, or Syr Humfrey Lynde, or the Doctours, or any other of the Company present at the Conference, so there is no reason why any difficulty should be made therof at all. And as for the 2. point it seemeth to me there should be no great difficulty, in regard it is already agreed of all sides, that there must be one or other such Company of Christians, and among them Pastors & preachers so visible, as is said; and none besides the Catholique Romaine hitherto hath shewed a sufficient Catalogue of names of men in all Ages, who can with any colour be proued or defended, to haue beene professors of the true, diuine, infallible, Catholike, primitive, vncchanged faith, first deliuered by Christ, and his Apostles, & after continued in an orderly succession of visible Pastors & Doctours appoynted by God to be allwayes

in

in the Church of purpose, to preferre people of all ages from waivering in doubt of any point of faith, or being carried about with the wind of any vsptarr Error. Neither indeed can any such Catalogue be giuen, but it may be manifestly shewed to be insufficent, as either wanting names of men in some ages, or containing names of such as may certainly be proued to be no Protestants, but to differ in doctrine of sayth one from another, and to condemne one or other of the 39. Articles, vnto which English Protestant Ministers are sworne. Neuertheles if any one be not yet satisfied in this point, but will haue the Question made, whether the Protestant Church hath beene so visible in all Ages, as the names of their Pastours and Doctours may be shewed out of good Authors, I doe not see what better methode can be prescribed for an easy, speedy, & certaine resolution of the question, & sound satisfaction of all sorts of men, that shall desire to be resolved in this most necessary and important question, then that which M. Fisher prescribed in his second paper written before the Cōference, in which he required his Aduersaryes, 1. To set downe names in all ages of mē which they thought to be Protestāts. 2. To proue out of good Authors by some doctrine of theirs different from the Roman, that they were Protestants. 3. To defend thē to be Protestants, shewing that they did not differ in faith one from another, nor condemned any of the 39. Articles, vnto with all English Protestant Ministers are sworne, in regard otherwise they cannot be al of one Protestāt Church. I doe not (I say) see, what fitter methode can be prescribed for clearing the afore said Question of such visibility as is required, and presupposed to be in the true Catholique Church, then by actuall naming, proving

ning and defending, as is aboue said. For only to say there were, or to offer by arguments, exceeding the capacity of the comon sort of auditors, to proue, that there were men in all ages professing Protestancy, so visible, as that their names may be shewed out of good Authors, is no sufficient satisfaction; when especially one being vrged actually to shew these names, he will not shew actually any names, but of one or two ages, and such names as the Roman Catholiks, his aduersaries, by better right may & will name: and being still pressed to name more, he will not name more, but desireth first to dispute of these; which not being permitted till all be named, he most falsely then affirmeth that his Aduersary doth grant these to be Protestants, and so runneth away: To doe thus (I say) (as D. Featly did) is no fit way to giue satisfaction to all sorts, expecting resolution of the aforesaid most important Question. As it were a very insufficiēt way to giue satisfaction in a debt of twenty peeces of gold to another his creditor, if instead of actual payment required, he should say, and offer to proue by a Syllogisme, yea by a Demonstration *a priori*, that he can pay him the said twenty peeces: and being vrged to lay downe the particular peeces of gold, he saith, that by an Induction he will lay downe those peeces of gold one after another; and being further pressed to do so, he not hauing one peece of gold of his owne taketh out of his Creditors purse one, or two, or more peeces, and laying downe one or two of them, sayth, loe heere is one or two towards the twenty; and being neuer so much vrged, he will not lay downe any more vntill his Creditour first dispute with him, whether these two or three peeces layd downe, be his owne or no; and being heereupon seriously told

I

by

by his Creditor, that vnles he layd downe al the peeces of gold, he did not satisfy the debt, but lost his credit, and forfeited his band, he then falleth into passion, and sayth: What, will you haue me eate my dinner at a bit? I cannot lay downe all at once: Will you dispute with me about these or no? Which his Creditor refusing to do, vntill all the twenty peeces be actually layd downe, he lastly sayth: Well, you will not dispute about these? You graunt these to be myne: and so without expecting answer, he turneth to the company, saying, he granteth these to bemyne, and taketh vp his cloake and runneth away, not regarding that his Creditor so soone as he can open his mouth, biddeth him stay, and denyeth any such grant to haue beene made by him: yea offereth to dispute with him of that point, if he will stay: I suppose no man will thinke this kind of dealing to be an honest and good satisfaction in a debt of money: and therefore much lesse should it be accounted good in matters of farre more importance and value, and specially in satisfying this (by D. *Featly* vndertaken) debt of shewing names of visible Protestants in all ages, out of good Authors.

§. 4. *About the manner of proceeding of the Disputant.*

By this which hath beene now sayd, and that which was heard and seene by those who were present at the Conference, may appeare how vnfitly D. *Featly* proceeded in his Syllogisme, and his Induction: for in the one, to wit, his Syllogisme, he endeauoured to auoid that plaine methode prescribed by M. Fisher before the meeting, of naming men in all Ages, and prouing and defending those he named to be Protestants

stants, and sought to draw the disputation into particular Controuersies, which the capacity of thole (for whose satisfaction the disputation was ordained) and of diuers others who were present, could not sufficiently comprehend. Now concerning the other, to wit his Induction; first, it was long before he could be drawne to it: secondly hauing vnderraken to make it full (and as the Question required) in all Ages, he (hauing only made it (and that most falsely) for the first Age) would not proceed further, vnles his Aduersary would first dispute with him (in particular Controuersies) about those whome he named in the first age: which particular disputation (being of meer Tergiuersation and delay) because his Aduersary would not presently permit, but told him, that he must first make his full Induction, and then he would answere him as much as need should be in all particulars; he either hauing no patience to expect, or rather intending to take any such lyke occasion to break off the Conference, before he should be further pressed to giue this full Induction (which with credit he can neuer giue) made such an abrupt end, as in this my Relation is declared.

Now, for the manner which both D. VVbite, &c. he obserued in the proceffe of the conference, it was noted, that it had not that *decorum*, which the circumstance of their persons and places should promise. For it no way suited with the gray haire and grauity of a Doctour, and a Deane, to haue laughed and fleered so much as D. VVbite did, vpon no cause. And for D. Featly, both his lookes, speeches, iests, and gestures were such, as did not become him, but might better haue befeemed a Stage-player then a Doctour and an Archbishops Chapline, and discouered a mind not so

tempered, as had beene requisite in one who pretended to be a Teacher of true Diuinity. Finally his whole carriage in this busines shewed, that he rather sought to please his Audience, and to gaine applause to himselfe, then soundly to satisfy that most important Question, of the visibilty of the Protestant Church.

On the other side, *M. Fisher*, and *M. Sweet* behaued themselues moderatly, not only in the eye and iudgement of Catholiques, but also of others: so as euen their greatest Aduersaryes could not take exception against them. And one of the principall Protestants present hath since (in respect of temper & modesty) giuen speciall commendations of them, & far preferred them before his owne Church-men. And as the methode which *M. Fisher* prescribed before the meeting, is already shewed to be the fittest that could be, for giuing good satisfaction to the old Gentleman and all others, so in my opinion both he and *M. Sweet* did very well to stand (as they did) constantly to it, prudently foreseeing, when the Aduersary would haue diuerted them from it, and warily so answering his his arguments, as that for all he could say, they would not suffer themselues to be transported from the proposed Question, and the prescribed Methode; but still kept the Aduersary to the point, & would not permit him to diuert, either to dispute about Christ or his Apostles, or any other point, vntill names were giuen in all Ages, which was the point demanded and vnder-taken. The which course they tooke vpon iust and good reason, and not for any distrust or diffidence (as some Protestants did inconsideratly imagine) that they could not defend Christ and his Apostles not to haue beene Protestants, or any particular point of those

those which D. *Fearly*, or D. *White* vnseasonably proposed, or any other held (in such sense, as it is held as a point of fayth) by the Catholike Roman Church; which they could, and would haue defended, & proued if need had beene, or if the meering had beene intended and appointed for that purpose. The reason therefore why M. *Fisher* might well refuse to enter into such particuler disputes, before full Induction of Names were ended, was, for that this had beene to follow two Hares at once, and so to catch neither, and to leaue that which was most pertinent to the present Question, and which most imported to be decided in the first place, as being the oly thing in which the old Gentleman, and many other of the AudIENCE did particularly expect, and desire to be satisfied, and being a most easy and assured meanes to help them to be satisfied in all other matters in Controuersy; & without which, it is most hard, or rather impossible euer to attaine certaine and infallible Resolution in all particular, euen most necessary, points of fayth, as M. *Fisher* expresely shewed, and proued by a sentence aboue cyted out of D. *Field*.

A second reason might be; for that all disputatiō about particulers (before the true Church were by her perpetuall visibility, or some such euident marks found out, and acknowledged, as a sufficient meanes appointed by God to instruct all sorts, in matters of fayth, and to preserue vnyty, and determine Controuersyes of fayth) would haue beene fruitlesse & endlesse. Which was the reason why M. *Fisher*, in another former conference had with a certaine Minister would not enter into any particulers, vntill he had asked these generall Questions: 1. *What grounds the Minister would stand vpon?* The Minister answered,

Scripture: which M. Fisher accepting wrote downe, and then asked. 2. *Whether he would believe nothing but expresse wordes of Scripture?* The Minister answered *Yes, he would also beleene a good Consequence out of Scripture.* This also M. Fisher accepted, and wrote downe, and further asked. 3. *If it should happen, that the consequence which the Minister should bring, should not be thought good by him: and e contra, the Consequence brought by him should not be thought good by the Minister, who should iudge and end that fruitlesse, and otherwise endlesse contention and Controuersy?* The Minister sayd: *The Church.* M. Fisher very willingly accepted and wrote it down; & 4. asked: *Whether after the Church shall haue iudged and decyded such a Controuersy, it should be lawfull for any priuate man to oppose his iudgement against that, which the Church had so determined?* As for example, when *Catholikes and Arrians* hauing alleadged Scriptures, and pro and contra brought consequences out of the, about the Diuinity of Christ our Lord; The Church in a generall Councell iudged the consequences of *Arrians* to be naught, and those of the *Catholikes* good. The Minister sayd: *No, it was not lawfull for any priuate man to oppose his iudgement against such a Iudgement of the Church.*

These Questions being asked, M. Fisher ioyned issue vpon a question, bidding the Minister choose what he thought most materiall against Roman *Catholikes*, and let it be tryed, whether the Church did iudge for *Catholikes*, or *Protestants*. The Minister did choose the Question about *Merits*, and tooke for his tenet, *That there was not any Merit of man before God.* And when the day of tryall came, the case was so cleere against the Minister, in the ancient Fathers (whome the Minister granted to be the Church) even by

by confession of the *Magdeburgians*, that the Minister had no shift, but to diuert the disputation from the substance of the proposed Question, to a circumstance of *Commutative Iustice*, and that equality betwixt the *VVorke* and the *Reward*, which is written of by *Bellarmino*. About which circumstance *M. Fisher* was content to dispute after he had plainly shewed the substance of *Merit* out of the ancient Fathers. Comming therefore to dispute about the aforesayd circumstance of *Merit*, *M. Fisher* found, that there would be no end, nor fruit of the argument, in regard the ancient Fathers had not spoken of it in expresse tearmes, as they had done of the substance of *Merit*, & no other visible Church of this present age was agreed on, to whose iudgement this matter should be finally referred. By which experience, *M. Fisher* hath learned, how endlesse and fruitlesse it is, to waste wordes about particulars, vntill both parties be agreed which is the true Church, not only in ancient tymes, but also of this age. So as after ech party hath sayd what he can, the finall resolution of the Question may be referred to that present Church, which (hauing without interruption of Pastours and Doctors, and without change of doctrine successiuelly descended from the true visible Church of anciēt tymes) is by this, and other Markes proued to be the present true Church, whose Iudgment no priuate man must oppose. This Question therefore of the continual successiue visible Church, being so necessary to end al Controuerfies, and being now proposed to be treated of betwixt *M. Fisher* and *D. Featly*, *M. Fisher* had great reason not to permit speach of any other particular Question, vntill by his prescribed Methode, he had gotten it clearly seen, that the Protestant Church was

not

Not, and the Catholique Roman Church was the only true Church, to whome it pertayneth to giue Iudgement of, and determine Controuersies, and to instruct all sorts of men in the true Faith, and not to permit men by their priuate interpretations of Scripture to wander in errors, or wauer in in certain ties, or spend their tyme in fruitles, and endles disputations about controuersies of faith: It being most certaine, that these can neuer be with fruite, and sully ended, but by the censure of the true visible (not only ancient but also present) Church, which must when doubt is (as most often is) made, tell ys, what particuler books be true bookes of Scripture and Fathers, which be true translations, and which be right interpretations: for both about Scriptures & Fathers such Questions may arise, and cannot be well decided whout the Iudgement of the true present visible Church, in regard Scriptures and Fathers do not alwaies sufficiently expresse what is to be held in the aforesaid Questions; neither will one priuate man, in such cases, follow anothers opinion, when ech man will be easily inclined to thinke that he hath as good Scriptures, or Fathers, or Reasons, or all these together, to plead for the truth of his opinion, as another hath for his.

This reason may be confirmed out of *Tertullian* who in his golden booke of *Prescriptions*, giueth diuers reasons why Heretikes (who reiect the authority of the Church) should not be admitted to dispute out of Scriptures. First, for that (by their disputations) they weary those that be firme, they overcome those which be weake, and those which be in a middle disposition, they dismisse with scruple or doubt. Another reason *Tertullian* giueth, because, this Heresy doth not receaue some Scriptures, or if it receaue, it peruertereth them to their owne purpose, *which*

Tertull. de
prescrip. c. 15.

Cap. 17.

with additions and detractions; and if it receaue some, yet not whole, or if whole in some sort, yet by false expositions it turneth them (from the right) to a peruerse sense. And a peruerse, or corrupt sense (sayth he) is as contrary to truth, as is a peruered or corrupted Text. Cap. 19.

Tertullian therefore for these reasons iudged best not to make the combat in Scriptures, but that this gappe should be stoppt, and that Heretikes should not be admitted to any disputation of Scriptures; and he telleth how this may be done, saying: *It must be examined to whome the possession of Scripture doth belong, to the intent that he who hath no right vnto them, may not be admitted vnto them.* And further he sheweth, That the right order of things requireth, that first it only be disputed, to whom the Fayth belongeth? (As if he should say, which is the true visible Church?) *VVhose are the Scriptures? From whome, by whome, when, and to whome was deliuered that discipline, by which they are made Christians? for where there shall appeare the truth of Christian sayth and discipline to be (as doubtles it is in the true visible Church of Christ) there shalbe truth of Scriptures, and expositions, and al Christian Traditions.* And hauing shewed how Christ did promulgate his doctrine by the Apostles, he further prescribeth: *That, what Christ, and his Apostles did preach, must be learned no other wise then by the Churches which they founded: so as euery doctrine agreeing with those Apostolicall & Mother-Churches, that is to be deemed true; and what doth not agree, to be iudged false.* And therefore to make it apparent, that the Heretikes opinions (although pretended by themselues to be conformable to Scriptures, and such as may be proued out of Scriptures) are not Apostolicall, nor true, he vrgeth them (as M. Fisher vrged D. Featly) to shew the beginning of their Churches, and to ynsould the order of their

Cap. 20. 21. 22
& sequent.

Cap. 32.

K

Bishops

Bishops, so from the beginning running downe by succession, as that their first Bishop had some of the Apostles, or some Apostolicall man, who persecuted with the Apostles, for his Author and Predecessour; and hauing giuen examples of the Catholike Churches, who can thus vnfold the order of their Pastours, and namely Rome for one, he sayth afterwarde: *Confingant tale quid Haretici*: Let Heretiques euen feigne some such like thing.

Thus we see what Tertullian did say to Heretikes of his tyme, by which we may learne what we may say to the Nouellists of our tyme, whome (offering to dispute with vs about Scriptures) we may altogether debarre from Scripture, and may examine them, as Tertullian did those of his tyme, saying: *VVho are you? VVhen, and whence came you? VVhat haue you to do in my ground, you that are not myne? By what right dost thou, O Marcion (we may say, O Martin Luther) cut down my woods? By what licence dost thou, O Valentine (O Caluin) diuert, or turne aside my fountaynes? By what power dost thou, O Apelles (O Anabaptist) remoue my limits? VVhy do you, O the rest of Heretikes, sow and seed according to your owne will vpon my Land and pasture? It is my possession, I am the ancient possessour, I haue the firme Originalls from the Authors themselues, to whome the propriety did first belong: I am the heyre of the Apostles; as they did ordaine in their Testament and last will, as they did commit it to my faithfull Trust, as they did adiure me, so I hold it. But you they haue disinherited and cast out, as strangers and enemies &c.* So as by this prescription of Tertullian, vntill D. Featly, or some other can by other markes then by alleadging wordes of Scripture (as by perpetuall visibility, and interrupted succession of Bishops &c.) proue Protestants not to be Heretikes, but the true Church of Christ, and the right heyre of the Apostles,

to whome cōsequently belongeth the most ancient & first possession of Scriptures, M. Fisher had good reason and right to deferre disputing with him (out of Scripture) of Christ and his Apostles, vntill he had made his full Induction of Names of Protestant Church-men, and vnsoulded the orders of their Protestant Bishops, so running downe from the beginning by succession, as that their first Protestant Bishop had some of the Apostles, or some Apostolicall man, who persevered with the Apostles, for his Author & Predecessour. The which I accompt to be so impossible for him to doe, as I dare, and do challenge him, saying with *Tertullian*: Conſingant tale quid *Hæretici*: Let D. Featly (or any of his fellow Protestants) at least feigne (because I am sure they cannot find) Names of Protestant Bishops, and Pastors, whome they do imagine (for proue they cannot out of good Authors) to haue beene in all ages. Which whiles they do not, al sorts of people haue iust cause to thinke, that neither D. Featly, nor D. VVhite can performe that taske, which they did too-to boldly vndertake of naming, prouing, and defending visible Protestants in al ages: & therupon al men may, as I do, conclude, That the Protestant Church hath not beene so visible in all ages, as the Catholike Church ought to be: and consequently, the Protestant Church is not the true Catholique Church which we professe to beleue in our Creed; Neither consequently, are their Pastours, and Doctours and Preachers lawfully sent, or sufficiently authorized, to teach and expound Gods word; nor consequently, are people securely warranted to learne of them, what is, and what is not to be believed by infallible diuine sayth necessary to saluation; nor indeed ought they to beleue or heare them at all, but ought to vnite themselves to that One, Holy, Catholike, Apostolike, perperually visible Roman

man Church, hearing, beleeuing & obeying the Pastors thereof; whereby they may haue infallible instruction in all matters of fayth, secure direction for all matters concerning good life, in such fort as they may attaine remission of their finnes, and saluation of their soules; the grace of God in this life, and endles heauenly happines in the next. Vnto which I beseech sweet Iesus to bring vs all. Amen.

FINIS.

C 4957

96510

SL

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION

1959

AN
ANSWER TO A PAMPHLET,
INTITLED:
THE FISHER CATCHED IN HIS
OWNE NET.

IN VVHICH, BY THE VVAY, IS SHEVVED,
That the Protestant Church was not so visible, in al
Agas, as the true Church ought to be: and conse-
quently, is not the true Church.

Of which, men may learne infallible Faith, ne-
cessarie to Salvation.

By A. C.

MATTH. 28. vers. 19, 20.

*Going, teach al Nations, baptizing them, &c. Behold, I am
with you AL DAYES, euen to the consummation of the
World.*

EPHES. 4. vers. 11, 14.

*Christ gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets; othersome
Euangelists, and othersome PASTORS and DOC-
TORS, &c. that we be not Children, WAVERING
and CARRIED ABOUT with euerie wind. of Doc-
trine, &c.*



M. D. C. XXIII.

them) might in some sort be so tearmed; as being directed by D. Featly to his owne end, of transferring the Question to particular Controuersies, but not *ad directum finem*; that is, not ordayned to the direct end of the whole Disputation: *viz.* To shew a visible Church of Protestants in all ages, whose names may be shewed out of good Authors. Which (supposing D. Featly would haue proceeded sincerely) ought to haue beene his onely end: as M. Fisher signified, by saying these words; *Responsum nullum dabunt prater unum quod nunquam dabunt, ecce nomina.*

D. Featly therefore had no iust cause to say, as the Protestant Relator maketh him say: It is a Bul,
 " M. Fisher, *media, directa*, yet not *ad directum finem*;
 " that is, direct, and not direct: for *media* are said to be
 " *directa* onely *ratione finis*.

D. Featly (I say) had no iust cause to say this: and M. Sweet might wel tel him of his fault, in seeking to transerre the Question from the Church, to particular points of Faith, as the Protestant Relator saith he did; saying:

" Is not, *Transitio a genere in genus*, a fault in arguing? &c.

But M. Sweet did not speake these formal words which the Protestant Relator hath set downe: onely he asked the Doctors, Whether it seemed strange to them, that a Question should be transferred by a good Syllogisme: which he said, in regard D. Featly endeouored to proue his argument to be pertinent, because his Syllogismes were good.

Here D. Featly (as the Protestant Relator telleth) said: I acknowledge, that *Transitio a genere in genus*, is a fault in disputing; but I neuer heard, that the inference of the effect by the cause, was *Transitio a*

" ge-

“ *genere in genus* : such was my argument. For Faith
 “ in a Beleeuer produceth profession and confession
 “ thereof, which makes a visible member; and the like
 “ profession of many members, a visible Church. Where
 “ the cause is perpetual, the effect must needs be per-
 “ petual : Therefore, where the Faith is perpetual, the
 “ profession thereof must needs be; and consequently,
 “ the visibilitie of the Professors thereof, is this *Tran-*
 “ *situs a genere in genus*?

But D. Featly did not say al this; yet if he did, it
 doth not make any thing against M. Sweet: and for him
 to speake of the cause, being obscure, when the Question
 is onely about the effect, being more apparant and cleare
 (as in our case) is a fault in honest and sincere dealing.
 Neyther is M. Sweets Logicke lesse to be esteemed, if
 he had termed that fault *Transitus a genere in genus* :
 For a cause as a cause, and an effect as an effect doe not
 onely differ *specie*, but also *genere* : and beside, a prooffe
a priori and *a posteriori* are diuers kinds of prooffes.

“ Here (sayth the Protestant Relator) those of
 “ M. Fishers side calling for Names, D. White said :

“ Where are your Names? said T : *200* *100*

“ This is nothing but apparant regeneration. You

“ will not answer any argument directly, nor suffer vs to

“ proceed in our arguments; and therefore I require

“ you, M. Fisher, according to the order mentioned in

“ the beginning, for each partie to haue an hour and a

“ halfe for that you now oppose, and suffer me to

“ answer.

“ Proue by Christ and his Apostles, or by any of the

“ Fathers for the first six hundred yeeres, these present

“ Tenets of the Roman Church; and then he named

“ (as the Protestant Relator sayth) sixe particular

“ Points.

But D. *White* did not speake thus, neyther did he in al the Conference make any such long discourse. Yet if he had so said, M. *Fisher* might wel haue answered, as the Protestant Relator saith he did.

M. *Fisher*. " When you D. *White*, or D. *Fenly*, haue
" proued your Church to be visibie in al ages, and na-
" med visibie Protestants; then wil I satisfie your de-
" mands."

But before this was done, M. *Fisher* had no reason to diuert to those particular matters, nor to produce Names of Catholikes in al ages; in regard it was his aduersaries fault to spend so long time in impertinent Syllogismes, which should haue beene employed in naming and prouing Protestants in al ages: which by the prescribed method was first to be done, before M. *Fisher* needed to proue any thing pertaining to the Roman Church. Worthily therefore might M. *Sweet* cal for Names of Protestants, and wel might he say: That if Protestants had beene in al ages, their Names (at least some) in every age might be produced.

Vnto which, as the Protestant Relator saith, D. *Fenly* replied, saying: That is a *Non sequitur*, &c. What say you to a People of Africa, who (if we may beleeue *Plinie*) haue no Names at al?

M. *Boulton*. Yet they haue descriptions, and may be knowne by some *Periphrasis*.

D. *Fenly*. What say you then to the Heretikes, called *Acephali*, who are so called, because their Head and Author cannot be named, nor particularly described, yet the Author was a visibie man. Are all visibie mens Names upon record? Are all the Records that were in former times, now to be produced?

To this Obiection, M. *Boulton* answered: That those
" *Acephali* held some particular Doctrine, which did
" amount

" amount to the nature of a Name, sufficient to distinguish them from others; insinuating hereby, that these *Asaphs* were not *Asaphs*. Further, it may be answered, That it is not certain, whether they had any particular Author: for some say, That they were a Company, who in the Controverſie betwixt *Iohn* the Bishop of Antioch, and *Euseb* of Alexandria, behaved themselves like Neutrals; submitting themselves to neither, as to their Head. Others thinke, That they were certaine men, who being the fauourers of *Petrus Mogus* the Heretike, did afterwards renounce him from being their Head, because he would not accuſe the Council of Calcedon. Others say, That one *Semerus*, Bishop of Antioch, was their Author.

But howſoeuer this particular were, it doth not conclude, That there could be in all ages viſible Profeſſors of the Proteſtants Faith, whereof no Storie nor other ancient Monument maketh mention of Names, or Opinions, or Places of abode of any of them, or of thoſe who opposed them: as Stories make mention of ſome of theſe circumſtances, both of the *Asaphs*, and whatſoeuer other eminent Profeſſors of either true or falſe Religion.

We doe not require, that all viſible men names ſhould be vpon record, nor all Records produced. For although to proue ſuch a viſible Church as that of our Saviour Chriſt, deſcribed in Scripture to be ſpread ouer the World, a ſmal number of viſible Profeſſors be not ſufficient, as *S. Auguſtine* produeth againſt the Doniſts; yet to ſhew how confident we are of our cauſe, we for the preſent onely require, That three eminent Proteſtants Names in all ages be produced out of good Authors. But they are ſo farre from being able to produce three, as they cannot name one in euery age, as is chiefly proued in the Proteſtants Apologie.

can they abide with any patience; when they be much pressed in this Point: as appeareth by others who haue beene vrged; and in particular, by *D. Feary*, in this Conference: who hauing beene called vpon several times to produce Names, as he had vndertaken; at one time he burst forth into these words, (set downe by the Protestant Relator; *What? wil nothing content you, but a Buttrie-Booke? You shal haue a Buttrie-Booke, if you wil stay a while.*

Note (Reader) this Doctors want of grauitie and patience, and what a fit Title he giueth to a Catalogue of Names of Protestants, who (indeed) are more like to be found in a Buttrie-Booke, then in any good Record of Antiquitie: as hauing had their beginning of late in one *Martin Luther*; who, after his Apostasie, more respected the Buttrie, then any Ecclesiastical Storie.

But how unwilling *D. Feary* was to bring out this his Buttrie-Booke, appeareth; in that after the Auditorie had long stayd and often called for the Names of Protestants in al ages, which should haue been giuen at first, after not onely Catholikes, but also diuers of the Protestants (being wearie and not willing to heare any more of his dilatorie and impertinent Syllogismes), had entreated him to giue ouer his arguments, and to produce Names.

First, he said: If I should giue ouer, *M. Fisher* would say of me, as he said of *D. White*, That I was at a *Non-plus*: and therefore I wil goe forward, in arguing.

To which, *M. Fisher* said: Then wil I goe forward, in answering.

But the Companie earnestly calling for Names, *D. Feary* had the Writer set downe in writing, That

by which will be perceived, that to let this the Company be
would have been a great benefit. As was said by A. only this

Which Mr. Fisher seeing to be written, said: Vn-
lesse this be blotted out, it shal be set downe for An-
swer: That, *with* D. Featly, having diverted from
the subject of the Question, will now speake to the
purpose, and will shew that the words are not true.

Mr. Sweet also said: That it was a manifest wrong.
Whereupon the former words were blotted out.

And it was written (as the Protestant Relator sayth)

"That both the Disputants being willing to proceede

"D. Featly was desired by the Company, to produce the

"Names of such Protestants as were extant before Lu-

"ther, in all ages.

This being written, and subscribed both by D. Featly
and M. Fisher, D. Featly proceeded to his Inductio.
But before he would begin to name any, he first endea-
voured to fore-stall his hearers with an ill opinion against
M. Fisher, saying:

There is no credit to be giuen to this man, who not
onely slandered D. White in a former Conference, but
also falsely writ what passed betwixt M. Mylkes and
my selfe, in a certaine Disputation.

M. Fisher hearing this false slander, did rise vp, and
for the honour of the Truth, and clearing of his
Credit, did (before the Audience) solemnely pro-
test, upon his Conscience: That wittingly and wil-
lingly he did neuer wrong eyther D. White, or D. Featly,
in report of any former Conference. And if any
thing were false written, it was not willingly: but
as the Protestant Writer of this present Conference
hath sometimes mistaken the words of the Disputants;
which, as he (being warned) did correct: so did I
(said M. Fisher.)

To this, nothing was replied: and therefore I suppose that the Audience was well satisfied of *M. Fishers* sincerity in his Relation, and writing of the former Disputations.

After this, *D. Featly* named for the first age, our Lord and Saviour Christ, and the Twelve Apostles, and *S. Paul*, and *S. Ignatius*: after which he stayed a while, as if he studied for more Names; but not remembering any more, whom he would set downe for the first age, he said: These, not denying others, may serue for the first age.

Then turning to *M. Fisher*, he said: Let vs dispute of these. No, said *M. Fisher*; name first of al ages: What? said *D. Featly*, wil you not dispute of Christ and his Apostles? Yes, said *M. Fisher*, in due place: but first name the rest in al ages, and then I wil answer you. What? said *D. Featly*, doe not Christ and his Apostles deserue the first place? *M. Fisher*: I wil not answer, before you haue named the rest.

Then, said *D. Featly*, in a heat: Wel, you wil not dispute of Christ and his Apostles? Then you grant, Christ and his Apostles to be Protestants. And so instantly (without expecting *M. Fishers* answer) he turned himselfe to the Audience, and said: He grants Christ and his Apostles to be Protestants. Whereupon diuers of the Audience made such a shewt (as if they had gotten a Victorie) with such a voyse, as *M. Fisher* endeouoring to answer, for a time could not be heard. But he rising vp, and with his Hand and Voyce crauing silence, made such as would heare him, vnderstand how falsely *D. Featly* had slandered him to his Face; and eyther then, or vpon some like occasion, he said: What may I expect behind my backe, when you thus mis-report me to my Face?

And

And in this sort when many of the company were willing to depart, D. Featly (being called vpon as it seemed) by some of his companions to goe away, did arise and offer to begone: yet in his ryling he turned to M. Fisher, saying: *Will you dispute vpon Christ and his Apostles, or no?* To which M. Fisher sayd, *I will, if you will stay.* And stretching out his hand, he tooke D. Featly by his arme, offering to stay him, yet he in that abrupt manner went away.

This is the true Relation of this last passage; by which the falshood of that Relation which is made by the Protestant Relator, may appeare: For to make the best of D. Featly his Tergruisation, or rather plaine flight from proceeding in his Induction, and to cast some colour ouer the matter, by which he may make Protestants belieue, that D. Featly had reason, and M. Fisher was to blame; First he maketh M. Fisher say, *You shall not begin with Christ and his Apostles:* as if M. Fisher had prohibited him to begin with the names of Christ and his Apostles, which he did not: neyther did he say those words at all, which the Relator reporteth. Secondly he suppresseth in silence M. Fishers expresse yealding to dispute about Christ and his Apostles, which M. Fisher did expresse two seuerall tymes: once thus, *I will dispute of them in due place:* the second tyme when D. Featly would needs begon, and in going asked, *will you dispute or no?* thus, *I will, if you will stay.* Thirdly he relateth a Syllogisme to be made in this last passage, which is not remembred; but if it were, it was very impertinent to an Induction, and may easily be answered out of that which was formerly sayd against a like Syllogisme called by D. Featly, *A Demonstration a priori*, but is proued not to be so much worth as a probable prooffe *a posteriori*. Fourthly he relateth a coniuering

F charge

charge to haue byn made by D. Featly to M. Fisher, in this last passage, which was not made.

But to returne to the breaking vp of the Conference. So soone as D. Featly had in the abrupt manner afore-sayd, gone away, and left M. Fisher and M. Sweete, and diuers others of good ranke sitting at, or neere about the Table, amongst whome was the Earle of Warwick, who not liking (as it seemed) that the matter should end in that ill fashion, made a speech to M. Fisher, and tould him, that the Doctour should come againe, and giue the rest of the Names of Protestant Professours after some dayes, it being requisite that the Doctour should haue tyme to study for them. To which M. Fisher sayd, he was willing he should take tyme. Then the wryting of such things as had passed in the Conference (being subscribed vnder D. Featly, and M. Fishers hands) was wrapped vp in a paper, and sealed vp with three seales, one with my Lord of Warwicks, and the other with two other seales, & left in Syr Humfrey Lynds hands, or some other Protestant, with promise that it should be kept vnopened till the next meeting, and that M. Fisher afterwards should haue it, or a true copy of it: which promise hath not yet been performed, partly by reason the next meeting was prohibited; but by whose meanes this prohibition came, although I will not Censure (as the Protestant Relator sayth, a Romanist hath confidently auerred) that the Protestant party laboured to haue all future meetings, touching this occasion, forbidden, because they cannot make good that which they haue vndertaken about naming of Protestant Professors in all ages; yet I canot hinder men to haue such like suspicion, because I know it is impossible for Protestants to performe that vndertake Taske.

Now

Now whereas my self have heard that some suspected, that the Catholike party had made meanes to get the second meeting hindered, this idle fancy hath no foundation of any probability: For all Catholikes are confident, that Protestants can neuer produce out of good Authours, Names of the Professors of this their new Reformation, no more then any other Sect of Heretikes can produce the Names of men of their profession in all Ages since Christ: whereas Roman Catholikes in their printed Bookes ordinarily set downe the Names of their Professors, and chiefe Pastors in all Ages: And soe the victory being so certaine on their side, they had no reason to hinder the meeting, whereby this question should be determined, especially in such sort as is prescribed in *M. Fishers* second paper (aboute shearfed) written before the last meeting. And in-particuler for *M. Fisher* and *M. Sweet*, it is most certaine, that they much desired the second meeting, as may appeare: First, in that the next day after the last meeting, they went to *Syr Humfrey Lynds* house, offering to give vnto him a Catalogue of Names of such as they would defend to haue been Professors of the Roman Fayth in all Ages, that he might deliuer it to *D. Feaily* and *D. White* to consider of agaynst the next meeting, vpon condition that they should also reciprocally deliuer vp to *M. Fisher*, & *M. Sweet*, a Catalogue of such as they would defend to haue been Protestants in all Ages, to be considered off against the sayd next day of meeting. The which offer seemed to another Protestāt (who was then in *Syr Humfrey Lynds* company) very reasonable and equal). But *Syr Humfrey* sayd: No, I knowe the Doctors mynd, that they will not giue vp any Catalogue before the very meeting: and he asked *M. Fisher*, why he did so much presse the Doctors for names of men of their

profession in all Ages? To whome *M. Fisher* answered that the reason (to deale plainly) was, because he was fully perswaded, that they could not giue vp any such Names. After this *M. Fisher* and *M. Swets* reflecting vpon *Syr Humphreys* words, began to suspect, that there would be no more meeting, vnles the *Earle of Warwicke* (who had engaged himselfe by his word to *M. Fisher* that it should be) did presse the Doctours vnto it: wherfore it seemed good that the *Earle* should be moued heerunto by a letter writtē by *M. Fisher* vnto him, the copy wherof I haue thought good, to insert heere as followeth.

Right Honourable Lord.

I esteeme it a speciall providēce of God, that your Lordship was present at a late Conference, wherein *D. White* and *D. Featly* vndertooke to shew against me, & my companion, that the Protestan Church had been visible in all Ages, and that their Professors might be named, especially in all Ages, before *Luther*. Your Lordship may remember the substance of all the prooffe to haue consisted in this, *That the true Church was alwayes so visible, as the Professors thereof in all Ages might be named: But the Protestants was the true Church*; we refused to dispute of the *Minor*, because it transferred the question, and auoyded that plaine prooffe of the visible Church, which was then propounded and expected. If, as they conclude, they are able to name their Professors in all Ages, why did they refuse to giue vs a Catalogue of theirs, as we were ready to haue given them another of ours? Why went they about to proue they were able to name them, when with lesse adoe they might haue named them? Where deeds are iustly expected, words without deeds are worthily suspected.

Certainly heerby they are so farr from hauing discharged

charged themselves, of the great enterprife they vnder-
 rooke, as they stand more engaged then before to the
 performance of it: for hauing now professed and ack-
 nowledged that the true Church, or (to vse their owne
 words) the Church which is so visible as the true Ca-
 tholike Church ought to be, (and the Church whose
 sayth is *eternall* and *vnchanged*, must be) is able to name
 her Professors in all Ages, eyther for their owne ho-
 nour, and for the satisfaction of the world, they must
 set downe the Names of their Professors in all Ages, or
 els they shamefully discouer themselves not to be that
 true and visible vnchanged Church which is able to
 name them. Againe, at the length yealding as they did
 to shew the continuall visibility of their Church, by a
 full induction of their visible Protestants in all Ages
 (which they seemed to vndertake with great confi-
 dence) why did they sticke in the first Age alone, refus-
 ing to name their Professors in the Ages following,
 vntill the first were tryed? May not the Answerer
 choose to deny which parte of the Argument he plea-
 seth? And was it euer heard that he should be inforced
 to reply to one proposition alone, before the whole
 Argument, whether it were Syllogisme or Induction,
 were fully propounded? Very Nobly therefore, & pru-
 dently your Lordship in the end desired another mee-
 ting, not doubting that your owne party with in 3. or
 4. dayes, would be content to giue vs the Names of
 their Professors in all Ages, as we were ready to giue
 them the Names of ours, that therby both sides might
 be the better prepared for a second Tryall, which whe
 they haue performed, we shall not fayle to encounter
 with them, eyther by way of speech or wryting, as
 your Lordship (all things considered) shall thinke fai-
 rest, or safest, or most conuenient for the discouery of
 Truth.

But if your Lordship shall not be able to obtaine at their hands this your most iust and important Request, the defect of proof on their part must needs be accounted a plaine flight; and no man hereafter can prudently relye his saluation ypon that Church, which (for want of perpetuall visibilty proued) they themselues shall haue concluded to be false and sayned.

Thus expecting the yssue heerof, and your Lordships further pleasure from the mouth of this bearer, I remaine, this first of Iuly 1622.

Your Lordships seruant in Christ,

John Fisher.

By this Letter it may appeare how willing M. Fisher and M. Swense were, and yet are, of their part, to haue the matter soundly prosecuted, eyther by meeting or wryting. And I haue heard that the Earle to whome this letter was written, did send so D. Featly, so, as although there be a prohibition of meeting, yet it is expected that by way of wryting D. Featly goes forward to performe his vndertaken Taske, and setting downe first the Names of such as he iudgeth to haue been Protestant Professors in every Age since Christ: And then prouing out of good Authors, those whome he nameth, to haue byn members of the Protestant Church, not condemning any one point wherein Protestants at this day do differ from the auncient and Roman Church, and especially in any one of the 39. Articles which English Protestant Ministers are sworn vnto; and therefore so long as D. Featly, and D. Whit shall be silent, and not so much as by wryting giue a Catalogue of Names of the Professors of their Church, all sorts of people may iustly take this their sayling for a flight, and for a silent graunting, that they haue not had

had visible Protestants in all Ages, whose Names may be shewed out of good Authors, as the question required. Wherupon followeth; that the Protestant Church is not the true Church of Christ, nor the Preachers thereof lawfully sent to teach, nor people securely warranted to heare and learne of them, what is, and what is not to be believed, by Fayth necessary to saluation.

CHAP. III.

Of the yssue of the Conference.

“THE Protestant Relator sayth, that the issue of
“ the Conference was, that the aforesaid *M. Bug-*
“ *ges* came to *Syr Humfrey Lynd*, & gaue him many thā-
“ kes for the sayd meeting, and assured him he was
“ well resolved now of his Religion; that he saw
“ plainly that it was but the Iesuits bragging without
“ proofes: and wheras formerly by their Sophisticall
“ perswasions he was in some doubt of the Church, he
“ is now so fully satisfied of the truth of our Religion,
“ that he doth vriterly disclaime the Popish Priests cō-
“ pany, and their doctrine also.

I haue cause to doubt that this which the Relator sayth, is not true, for thierby he maketh the old Gentleman to be but of a weake capacity, or of a very mutable nature. For first I am sure, there was no cause giuen in the Conference of any such effectuall resolution to be made by the old Gentleman. Secondly I cannot see when this speech should be made by the Gentlemā to *Syr Humfrey*. If immediatly after the Conference, it would argue toto much want of capacity: for if he did but rightly conceiue the true state of the question, in which himselfe had especially desired to be satisfied (as I verily

I verily hope he did) he might easily haue marked the insufficiency of *D. Fealy* his diuerting proofes, which also were so answered, as the Audience for want of satisfaction in them, yrged him to leaue off, & to produce Names of Protestants in all Ages: the which producing of Names being so often and earnestly required to be done in all Ages, and yet being only pretended (and that most fallely) to be done for one Age, and the Conference being so abruptly left of by *D. Fealy* before he would go forward to name men in other Ages, especially in Ages before *Luther*, as the Question required; any meane capacity might see, that the Question in which the old Gentleman desired to be satisfied, was not fully answered, nor consequently he satisfied.

Moreouer the same Gentleman being present when the *Earle of Warwick* told *M. Fisher*, that *D. Fealy* should at another tyme come againe to giue Names of Protestants in other Ages, he might easily, and doubles did, vnderstand that as yet Names in all Ages were not giuen, nor consequently the Question satisfied, in which he expected answere. Furthermore presently after he went away from the Conference, he told *M. Fisher* himselfe, that he was glad, that at the next meeting his Question should be answered, which shewed that as yet he did not conceiue it to be answered.

Lastly, diuers dayes after all the trouble and styrr was past (which was made about the Conference) the old Gentleman was not so resolute a Protestant as the Relator pretendeth: for meeting *M. Fisher* and *M. Sweete*, he desired them to giue him a Catalogue of Names of Professors of the Romā Church, laying, that if after this the Doctors should not giue him a Catalogue of Protestants, he should dislike their cause. Which Catalogue *M. Fisher* and *M. Sweete* haue ready for him,
but

but will not deliuer, till he get the Doctours to make theirs ready, that he may bring to them the Doctours Catalogue with one hand, and receiue theirs with the other to deliuer to the Doctours.

All that can be suspected is, that in the very tyme, of the sayd styrr when the old Gentleman eyther was, or feared to be calied in question, it may perhaps be, that he might say those words which the Relator mentioneth; but this (if it were) was only vpon frailty or humane feare of trouble, and not any firme and settled resolution grounded vpon the Conference; sith both before and after he shewed a contrary mynd, as hath byn sayd.

As for other idle and false reports of a great Lady (a), or any other Catholiks sayd to haue ben turned Protestants vpon this Conference, I neglect them as being notoriously false. It may be that some Weaklings who not being present at the Conference, nor hauing commodity to heare what passed, but from the lying lyps of some Protestants (*Who reported that Fisher was overcome, and had yielded Christ and his Apostles to be Protestants*) some Weaklings I say, might perhaps be staggered, vntill they heard the true report, that this was only an impudent slander, vttered by D. Feally, but in words and deeds contradicted by M. Fisher. But I make no question so soone as these shall see or heare what is heere related, they will be well satisfied and confirmed in the Catholike truth; and that euen Protestants themselues, will be moued to harken more after the matter. And in case their Doctours doe not giue them a better Catalogue of Names of Protestants in all Ages, then they did in this Conference, they will doubt, as they haue cause, that the Protestant Church hath not byn so visible in all Ages, as (euen by

(a) This great Lady did expressly say: that the conference did make against Protestants, euen as it was related by you Protestant relator.

And another Lady, who was present at the conference did protest (to one that asked her, how it moued her) that she was by it confirmed in Catholique religion.

Lib 1. Inst. c.
1. Sect. 4.

By D. Feally his argument is proued) the true Catholike Church ought to be; and consequently that it is not the true Catholike Church, which in their Creede they professe to belieue, and out of which (as euen Calvin confesseth) they cannot hope for remission of their finnes, nor saluation of their soules.

CHAP. IIII.

Containing a Review, and Reflection vpon the Premises.

NOW hauing made an end of this Relation, I am to intreate the Gentle Reader, to renew it, or reflect vpon it, and to call to mind and marke. 1. The occasion, and consequently the end of the disputation. 2. The Question and true meaning of it. 3. What Methode was most fit to haue been obserued in treating of this question. 4. What course was taken by the Protestant Disputant, & what by the Catholike Respondent. All which being duely considered, thou wilt better see what is to be iudged of the whole Conference, and wilt make to thy selfe more benefit of the matter treated in it, then perhaps hitherto thou hast done.

§. I. *About the Occasion, and end of the Conference.*

1. The occasion of this Dispute was, as thou hast heard in the Relation, that a certaine old Protestant Gentleman was told (as the truth is) that there is no saluation out of the true Catholike Church, and that to belieue the Catholike Church, is one of the Articles of the Creed, which euery Christian is bound to belieue and know: and that this Church was no other besides

besides the most auncient and vniuersally spread ouer the world, the knowne Catholike Roman Church, which hath had, and can yet shew visible Pastours & other Professors in all Ages: and that the Protestant Church (wherof for the present, he was a member) sprung vp of late, and could not be the true Church of Christ, as not hauing had (as Christs true Church ought to haue) Pastours and Doctours, and lawfully sent Preachers so visible, as the Names of them may be shewed in all Ages out of good Authors. And this was the occasion of the dispute ; for heerupon the old Gentleman was so much moued in conscience to doubt of the Protestants Religion, that he could not be quiet till he had made meanes to get this matter discussed in a Conference betwixt Catholike and Protestant Diuines, in such sort as in the Relation hath byn told. And therefore, the end of this Conference was to giue this old Gentleman and others that should heare it, satisfaction in this most important & necessary point. I call this point, *most important and necessary*, in regard the certainty of euery other point belieued by infallible diuine Fayth, necessary to saluation, dependeth vpon it. For although euery point belieued by diuine Faith be in it selfe most true, and by reason of the Diuine reuelation (made knowne to the world by Christ & his Apostles) most certaine and infallible ; yet this truth & infallible certainty therof is not made knowne to vs (according to the ordinary course of Gods prouidence) but only by the meanes which God hath appointed, to wit, by Pastors, Doctours, and Preachers of the true visible Church of Christ.

Eph. 4. v. 11

&c.

Rom. 10. vj

14. &c.

4. 2. *About the Question and meaning of it.*

The Question propounded to be treated in the Conference vpon the occasion, and for the end aforesayd, was.

*Whether the Protestant Church was visible in all Ages,
" especially in the Ages before Luther: and whether
" the Names of such visible Protestants may be shewed
" in all Ages, out of good Authors?*

The reason why this question was proposed rather then any other, was, for that the old Gentleman was already perswaded that there must be in all Ages a visible Church of Christ, hauing in it visible Pastors & Docters, and lawfully sent Preachers who are by Almighty God appointed and authorized to teach, and of whom all sorts of people are commaunded & warranted to learne infallible Fayth necessary to saluatiō. And further, that this Church, and these her Pastors & Preachers, haue byn in all Ages past, not only visible, but so visible as the Names at least of some Pastours teaching, and some people learning the true Fayth in all Ages, might be produced out of good Authors. And therefore, as he had heard, the Roman Catholiks made no difficulty to produce out of good Authors the Names of their Pastors & people in all Ages: so he much desired to heare, whether the Names of Protestant Pastors and Preachers in all Ages could not also be produced out of good Authors: for if they could, he meant to remaine a Protestant as he had been all his life time: but if they could not, he thought it necessary to leaue the Protestants, and to adhere to the Roman Church, to learne of it Faith necessary to saluation.

By

By this appeareth that the sense and meaning of the Question could be no other then that which M. Fisher explicated in the Conference: viz. *Whether the Protestant Church was in all Ages so visible, especially in the Ages before Luther, as the Names of Protestant Pastors and Preachers in all Ages may be shewed out of good Authors.* And further that in case the Protestant Disputant should vndertake (as he did too boldly vndertake) the affirmative part, saying, and offering to proue in generall, that the Names of such Pastors and Preachers of Protestāt Religion may be shewed in all Ages out of good Authors; it should further be required (as M. Fisher required of him) that he should actually name in particular in euery seuerall Age such Pastors and Preachers as he thought he could proue and defend to be Protestants. For if the Question had not been thus vnderstood, it should not haue been answerable to the occasion and end aboue sayd. Neyther could the Protestant Disputant sufficiently satisfie the doubt of the old Gentleman, being chiefly caused in that he had heard, that no Protestant could name Pastors and Preachers of his profession in all Ages out of good Authors; So as (to satisfy this doubt) it was not sufficient only to say, nor only in generall to proue by such Syllogismes as D. Featly made, (which were such as the old Gentleman (I dare say) did not vnderstand) that the Names of Protestants in all Ages may be shewed, but as M. Fisher had shewed him a printed booke, in which Roman Catholike Pastours and people were in particular named in all Ages: so he expected Protestant Pastours, and people of all Ages to be named in particular, and after proued and defended to be Protestants, as M. Fisher was ready to proue and defend whom he would in particular name, to be Roman Catholikes.

Furthermore although it may seeme to some not much materiall, whether the Protestant Disputant hath begun to name first those of the first Age, & next of the second, and so downward vntill *Luther*, or contrarywise to beginne with *Luther* and so vpward till the Apostles and Christ; yet both the words of the Question, & the doubt of the old Gentleman had byn far better satisfied, and the Tergiuersation which *D. Featly* vsed in the first age auoyded, if *M. Fisher* had vrged him, as he might. first to beginne with the Age immediatly before *Luther* (a confessed Protestant) and so go vpward vntill Christ, the confessed Fountayne of infallible perpetuall vnnchanged Truth: for then it would haue been cleerly seene, euen by the Confessiō of learned Protestants, particularly *Luther* himselfe and others; that those who eyther are named, or can yet be named by *D. Featly*, after he hath sought (as I am told he went to seeke) Records in the great Library in *Oxford*, were not visible Protestants, but of a different Profession, Fayth, and Religion, and so different, as that they cannot be iustly deemed members of one and the same Protestant Church with *Luther*, after his Apostacy from his Religious Order, and reuolt from the Roman Catholike Fayth. For prooofe wherof, I for breuityes sake do refer euery one who desireth full satisfaction in this point, to what is largely related and proued in the Protestants Apology, in diuers places,

(1) *Luth. ep. ad Argentin. anno 1525.* but particularly *tract. 2. cap. 2. sect. 11. subdiuision 3.* And will only content my selfe to cyte these few testimonies for their sakes, who haue not commodity to see that booke.

(2) *Conradus Schuselb. in Theol. Calu. lib. 2. fol. 130.* First therefore (1) *Luther* himselfe sayth: *We dare boast that Christ was first published by vs.* Wherefore the *B. verius sine*, *Lutheran* (2) *Conradus Schuselburg* sayth: *It is impuden-*

cy to say that many learned men in Germany (and the like of other Countreys) before Luther did hold the doctrine of the Lutheran Gospell. And another (3) of them not only sayth in effect thus much, but proueth it by this argument: If there had beene right beleeuers that went before Luther in his office, there had beene no need of a Lutheran reformation. Another sayth: It (4) is ridiculous to thinke that in the tyme before Luther any had the purty of doctrine, and that Luther should receaue it from them, & not they from Luther: considering (sayth he) it is manifest to the whole world, that before Luthers tyme, all Churches were ouerwhelmed with more then Cymerian darkenes, and that Luther was diuinely rayssed vp to discouer the same, & to restore the light of true doctrine. And least this may be thought to haue beene only the conceipt of Luther and Lutherans (who yet could better tell then D. Featly, D. Whius, and such other new Maisters) I will add heereunto what is sayd, first by (5) Caluin, who doth acknowledge, That in this Lutheran reformation, there was made a discission or departure from all the world. Secondly by (6) Bucer, who calleth Luther, the first Apostle of the reformed doctrine. Thirdly, by Beza (7) a principall Caluinist, who teacheth that at this tyme, ordinary vocation of the Church-men was no where extant, and consequently teacheth, that there was at that tyme no visible Church; and so if any Church at all, it was only inuisible, as is affirmed euē by our owne English Protestant Deuines, namely M. Iewel, who sayth, The truth was vnknown and vnheard of when Martin Luther and Vldericke Zuinglius first came to the knowledge and preaching of the Gospell. And M. Perkins (9) who sayth: We say, that before the dayes of Luther, for the space of many hundred yeares an vninersall Apostacy ouerspread the whole face of the earth, and that our (Protestant) Church was not visible to the World.

(1) Geo. myll. in Augustanæ Confessionis, explic. art. 7. de Eccl. pag. 137.

(4) Benedict Morgélt. trac. de Eccl. pag. 143.

(5) Calu. in d. epist. ep. 141.

(6) Bucer. ep. ad Epist. Hereford.

(7) Beza in theol. ep. epi. 5.

(8) Iewel in his Apolog. of the Church. 4.

(9) Perkins in his defence exposit. of the Creed.

I might

(*) See the booke intituled: The Author and Substance of Protestant religio

I might adde many more (*) testimonies of others, who eyther in expresse tearmes, or in effect affirme the Protestant Church to haue beene in many Ages before *Luther* latent, and altogether inuisible: which indeed was the common opinion of Protestants at their first vprising; who on the one side thought they could with shittes, better answere places of scripture, which made often and honourable mention of the Church, then they could answere the euidence of Histories, and of their owne experience shewing that no visible Protestants were extant before themselves: But now of late, diuers plaine places of Scripture and Fathers hauing beene produced, and such euident reasons deduced out of them, prouing ineuitably that the true Church of Christ, of which all sorts must learne infallible fayth necessary to saluation, must needes be visible in all Ages, as, to omitt others, are these: My spirit which is in thee, and my wordes which I haue put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seede, nor out of the mouth of thy seedes seede from henceforth for euer. Againe: Their seed shall be knowne in Nations, and their branches among people: all that see them, shall know them, that these are the seed which our Lord hath blessed. Againe: Thy gates shalbe opened continually day and night, they shall not be shut, that the strength of the Nations and their kinges may enter into thee: for the nation and kingdome which shall not serue thee, shall perish. You are the light of the world: a City built vpon a hill cannot be hid. Tell the Church &c. He that will not heare the Church, let him be vnto thee as an heathen and Publican. Going, teach all Nations, baptizing them &c. Behould I am with you (to wit, your selues, and successors teaching and baptizing) all dayes vntill the end of the world. Conformable to which Scriptures, are also innumerable plaine places of ancient Fathers, which may be

Isa. 59. v. 21.

Isa. 61, 9,

Isa. 60, 11,

Matth. 5, 14,

Matth. 23, 17,

Matth. 23, 19,

20

may bee seene in *Coccius*: and among others *S. Aug.* *Coccins* in
stine who saith: that the Church being built vpon a mou- thesauro C6:
 -taine cannot be hid. trouerfiarum,
 tomo 1. lib. 8.

Out of these, and other plaine places of
 of Scriptures & Fathers, euident Reasons also may be
 deduced, shewing that the Church must needs bee
 visible in all ages. As for example, that otherwise it
 cannot bee such a Church as Christ did institute: nor
 could it performe those offices which Christ appointed
 it to performe: nor could those which were in it be
 instructed by it: nor those which were out of it be co-
 uerted to it: nor Heretiques (pretending to be the
 Church) convinced not to be it. Wherefore our later Pro-
 testants being not able to sayle any longer against
 this ineuitable *Scylla*, without apparent daunger to
 split their boate, would needes (rather then turne
 back to the safe haven of the visible Catholique Ro-
 man Church) aduenture vpon the *Charybdis* of con-
 temning all Monuments of ancient histories, and the
 plaine experience of their primitiue Protestant Patri-
 arches, hoping to escape by landing vpon the imagi-
 nary Iland of inuisible recordes, supposed to haue byn
 written, and after suppressed in the pretended Popes
 persecution of the visible Members of their inuisible
 Church, in the Ages before *Luther*, (a shift very vn-
 safe and such, as if it were good, might serue any other
 Sect of ancient, or present Heretiques, (as well as our
 moderne Protestants) if they would pretend to haue
 had a continuall visible Church of their profession.)
 But alas, who seeth not, that these be meere imagina-
 ry *Chymara's*, or dreames? For if any such people had
 beene (practizing especially rites of their religion,
 though neuer so secretly) they could not euen with a
 Giges ring haue passed vnseene, but eyther with their

H

positiue

positiue profession of their owne doctrine, which in some cases obligeth all true beleeuers, or at least with negatiue profession of sayth, by which all saythfull men, and at all tymes are obliged neuer to make shew and profession of a contrary religion; they, or some of them could not choose but to haue beene noted. And if for that cause any persecution were in that age, as is supposed, infallibly they would haue beene taken (as others of other Religions, in like cases ordinarily are taken) and imprisoned, or otherwise so punished, as the world could not haue beene ignorant of their persons, nor Historyes set out by friendes or enemies silent, in setting downe (as vsually is done) their names, conditions, opinions, punishments, and persecutions, in such tyme, such place &c. And if such recordes of such conspicuous things had been set down in historyes, it is not possible that the memory of such notorious matters could be razed both out of bookes, and out of the mindes of men, who without booke do continually deliuer in words to their successors what they saw with their eyes, or heard with their eares of their predecessors, or read in books to haue byn don to such persons as professed such a Religion, or to haue beene done to such bookes, in which mention was made of such persecution, made against professors of that Religion.

To say therefore that such persons were, and yet no record in any booke or other memory of them, or that once such Recordes were, but after were by the Pope razed, or burned, and yet no mention made in any booke, or other monument that such razing or burning of bookes was by such a Pope, at such a tyme &c. (as we can yet out of good Recordes tell the bookes burned by Dioclesian the Grande Persecutor

of Christians:) To say (I say) this, is senselesse, and plainly sheweth, that these men who sought to auoyd the *Scylla* of an inuisible Church, by this shift fall into the *Charybdis* of speaking against sense and experience, and indeed runne backe vpon the *Scylla* of the same inuisible Church; for auoyding whereof they deuised this sandy shift of inuisible Persecutours, inuisible Persecutions, inuisible Recordes of nameles (supposed to be visibly persecuted) members, of the Protestant Church in all Ages before *Luther*. O misery! O madnes of our poore deceaued Protestants! What? Is it possible, that *Luther* and *Lutherans*, *Caluin* and *Caluinists*, yea our owne Countrey-men prime Protestants, conuincd with the cleere euidency of things in their own dayes, and with plaine Recordes of all ancient Monuments for former ages, doe confesse (as you heare euen now) that *Luther* was the first that announced, or published Christ; that he was the first Apostle of the Reformed doctrine; and this so certainly, that they do account it impudency and ridiculous to say, That there were other visible Protestants in *Germany* before *Luther*; that they proue by argument this to be impossible; that they acknowledge themselves in this Lutheran Reformation to haue departed from all the world; that at *Luthers* and *Caluins* comming no ordinary vocation of Church-men (without which the visible Church cannot be) was extant in any place; that the Church both then, and for many hundred yeares before was wholly latent and inuisible? Is it possible, I say, that all this should be confessed by the primitiue Parents, and prime Doctours of Protestancy, and that now their professed children & schollers, and in respect of them, Punyes in Protestant diuinity, dare be so bold (as *D. Fealy* was in